CENTRAL ASIA : THE CONNECTING LINK BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

and other lectures

delivered by

Dr. Johannes Nobel

Professor of Sanskrit, University, Marburg (Germany)

at

The International Academy of Indian Culture

Nagpur

1952

SARASVATI VIHARA SERIES

edited by

Prof. Dr. RAGHU VIRA, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.et Phil.
Director,
International Academy of Indian Culture
in collaboration with other scholars

VOL. XXVI

Price Rs. 5/-

Published by
Dr. Lokesh Chandra, D.Litt
Secretary
The International Academy of Indian Culture
NAGPUR

Printed by
W. D. Ojha, Arya Bharati Press, Nagpur

PREFACE

The venerable Dr. J. Nobel has been staying at the Academy as a Visiting Professor, collaborating with us on the planning of the Śatapiṭaka, 'a Hundred Baskets', i.e. a uniform presentation in scientific editions of the entire Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit and allied literatures of the countries that lie to our north, east, south-east and south (namely, Tibet, Central Asia, Mongolia, China, Manchuria, Korea, Japan, Champa, Cambodia, Laos, Thai, Burma, Malay, Indonesia and Ceylon).

Indian adventurers and thinkers crossed mountains and oceans to blaze new trails of the spirit, as far and as long as goodwill and knowledge could carry them.

Professor Nobel tells a part of the story. He starts with Central Asia from where Indian art and scriptures spread out fanwise. His audience has listened to him in wonder and adoration. He has aimed in these lectures to reach out to the common man. The German tinge in his English expression has added to the charm, and this is retained unaltered even in the printed garb.

The third lecture 'Introduction of Sanskrit literature into Germany' was delivered at the Nagpur University under the distinguished chairmanship of His Excellency Shri M. D. Pakwasa, the Governor of Madhya Pradesh.

Nagpur,
19-3-1952.

RAGHU VIRA

CONTENTS

CENTRAL ASIA: THE CONNECTING LINK BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

We do not know where the Chinese originally settled, before they founded a well-organized state on the banks of the Yellow River and developed into a nation of extraordinary cultural importance. It is not unlikely that the Chinese immigrated from the West, for they differ greatly from the neighboring nations in regard to their cultural and mental setup. There is of course no definite proof available for the assumption that the Chinese really immigrated from the West, but the same proof is also wanting for the theory that they have always been in the very locations where we meet them first at the dawn of history. Some scholars are even inclined to assume that the Chinese script shows some dependence on the Egyptian hieroglyphs. There exists indeed a noteworthy similarity between a few Chinese characters and the corresponding hieroglyphs. Thus the Chinese ideogram denoting 'mountain' is a picture of a three-peaked mountain. The same picture is also found

in the hieroglyphs. The symbol for 'water' is in both cases a picture of three curved lines; so also the character for 'sun' a circle with a dot within. But, on the other hand, to give a picture of a thing three times is a common method to denote the plural, so that the first-mentioned two examples may be explained also as a mere coincidence. The fact, however, that both in Egyptian and in Chinese the symbol for 'sun' is a circle with a dot within, is indeed remarkable. There may be therefore some relation between the two old systems of script; but a strict proof can not be given.

At any rate no other nation in Central or East Asia was able to compete with the Chinese with regard to cultural importance. In China, on the banks of the Yellow river, the situation was rather different from the conditions in Mesopotamia or in Egypt, where nations, however great and long-living as the Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians and so on, were finally forced to give way to others and to disappear from history into oblivion.

The Chinese were aware of their strength and they did not doubt for a moment that it was their duty to play the leading part among

the nations inhabiting the vast territories of Eastern Asia. They expected and demanded that all tribes they met recognize their superiority. Wherever they deviated from this practice in rare cases, they probably realized that the distance between themselves and certain tribes was too great to permit the troops to be sent there to enforce subordination or the payment of tribute.

Undoubtedly, the Chinese attempted very early in their history to establish relations with the nations of the West. But unfortunately, they had little information about the conditions in the West of their empire, due to the fact that it was nearly impossible to travel to the West by land, as certain tribes, unconquerable for the Chinese, blocked the way.

There might have been connections with other countries across the oceans, but they were of little importance, their effect in history practically nil. It should also be kept in mind that the Chinese have never developed into a real seafaring nation.

Thus they were forced to try the land route which was beset with considerable difficulties; most formidable among them being the desola-

tion of the countries and, still more, the inimical attitude and resistance on the part of the tribes settling west of China.

Of these the Huns were the most noteworthy. The Chinese annals refer to them usually as Hiung-nu. In India, they were known as *Hūṇāḥ* and mentioned in the Mahābhārata, the Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa, the Viṣṇupurāṇa, the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and in other works. For centuries the Huns have constantly been a nuisance to the Chinese: they made it impossible for them to establish or maintain contact with the more distant countries in the West.

The Huns are already mentioned in the Spring and Autumn Annals of Confucius, 541 B. C. More important as a source of information is, however, the great historical work of Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien, which ends in 97 B.C., and the Annals of the earlier Han dynasty, ruling until 25 A.C.

The Huns were the main power in present Mongolia and from there constantly raided Chinese territories. Inspite of all efforts including the sacrifice of certain border districts, the Chinese emperors were unable to reach a tolerable agreement with the Huns or to ensure lasting peace.

Occasionally the Huns and other related

tribes like the Jong and the Tik were defeated in battles, but these military victories lasted only for short periods. The Huns kept watching for moments when a temporary weakness of the Chinese empire would enable them to resume and continue their raids. Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien states : 'At the time of I (?) (934 until 910 B.C.) the house (of the emperor) began to collapse. The Jong and the Tik formed a federation to attack China and to overpower this country. The nation was made to suffer all kinds of misery and the poets started to give themselves to sentimental self-pity. They sang : No house, no home is left due to those Huns ! Why did nobody take any action against those Huns, that serious danger ?'

Many years later, approximately in the middle of the eighth century A.C. Li T'ai-Po, one of the most famous Chinese poets, wrote the following poem about the Hun wars :

'The champion of the Yu-chou rides his
prairie horse,
He wears a tiger-fur cap, his eyes are green.
Smiling he brushes aside the arrows of the
enemies :
There is not one in ten thousand to challenge
him in battle.

He bends his bow curved like the moon
And hits the white wild-goose flying high
as a cloud.
He cracks his whip going a-hunting,
He goes far and wide, even to Lou-lan.
He rides out of the gate and does not look
back.
He does not think it hard to die for his
country.
There are those five chieftains of the wild
Hiung-nu :
They keep plundering and killing and never
give peace.
Their cattle and horses graze 'round the
Baikal Lake.
They eat their meat raw as wild beasts do.
Even when they live right on the Yen-chi-
shan,
They hardly take notice of the bitter cold
snow.
Smiling their wives go about riding on horse-
back,
Their cheeks are as red as bowls of red neph-
rite.
They easily kill with their arrows the fastest
of animals,

They swing in their saddles, intoxicated
with wine.
When the shining Pleiades can be seen
everywhere,
Their hordes swarm to battle like wasps;
Red blood running down the glittering blades,
Dyeing the sand with purple color.
Who is an experienced leader to guide us
now?
Such is the question of many a tired soldier.
When will Sirius, the evil star, cease to rule
the hour?
When will father and son enjoy the comfort
of peace?

Since the Huns themselves have not left any literary documents to posterity, we know little about their way of life. They were not one nation but rather a federation of several tribes, each ruled by a chieftain. Other clans of similar character and customs later joined this confederation. The Huns were a very warlike nation and definitely nomadic; they did not change until they finally disappeared in the torrent of history. Their strength rested in their cavalry, an excellent outfit with which the Chinese could not compete.

When the Huns first appear in history, they form a unit of not too many tribes, and no doubt originally a part of the Turk clans. This is indicated by a few Hun words spelt phonetically with Chinese characters and preserved in Chinese books. Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien tells us a few things about their way of life : 'They keep wandering back and forth always looking for water and eatable plants. They do not have fortified towns or permanent settlements, nor do they cultivate land, yet everyone of them owns a part of the soil. The art of writing is unknown to them. Contracts are made orally. Fighting from a distance they use bows and arrows, in closed battle swords and spears. They know nothing about the rules or duties of life. Chieftains and subjects eat the meat of domestic animals. They wear skins, using a fur coat as the uppermost garment The young men eat good rich food, while the old ones only get what is left over. Thus they honor those who are young and strong and despise the old and the feeble. When a man is dead the sons marry his wives, excepting only their own mother. After the death of a brother the others take his widow in marriage.'

During the third century B.C. the Huns

suffered temporary defeats and the Chinese emperor used this chance to build border fortifications in the North which later developed into the 'Great Wall'. It was intended to be a bulwark against sudden attacks by the Huns, but the latter resumed their raids and increased their power inspite of the 'Great Wall'. During the second century B.C. they extended their sway over the Tarim valley, Dsungary and other parts of Western and North-Western Asia.

Westward of the original homeland of the Huns settled the Yüeh-chih, who also played an important role in later Chinese history, but in a rather different way than the Huns. In the very beginning, the Huns were tributaries of the Yüeh-chih; in the third century B.C. however, and for another time in 177 B C., the Huns defeated the Yüeh-chih decisively, forcing them to leave their settlements in Kansu and to migrate toward the more distant West. They thus reached Kucha and from there the Ili river valley where they met another tribe, the Wu-sun, who were apparently related to the Huns, for both, the Wu-sun and the Huns, formed an alliance. Consequently, the Yüeh-chih could not settle in this area and again were compelled to move further to the West and the

South.

During their trek, the Yüeh-chih in turn forced another tribe, the Śaka, to leave their homes. These Śaka or Sê, as they are called in Chinese, continuously pushed by the Yüeh-chih, reached Kashmir and the Punjab in about 110 B.C., and from there started extensive and successful raids into Northern India. The Yüeh-chih, on the other hand, came to Ferghana and conquered Bactria. In the country south of the Oxus river they destroyed the rule of the Śakas and founded the sway of the so-called 'Great Yüeh-chih', as part of the Yüeh-chih had remained in Kansu and were styled 'Little Yüeh-chih' by the Chinese historians.

As stated above, the Huns became a great danger to the Chinese during the second century before Christ. Moreover they blocked the way to the West. The Chinese Emperor Wu-ti therefore thought it best to try to win the Yüeh chih for his cause, to form a coalition with them, and to defeat the empire of the Huns, which extended far into Tibet, by an attack from two sides.

It was one Chang K'ien, an extremely talented man, courageous and far-sighted, who volunteered to deliver the offer of the Emperor to the

Yüeh-chih, who were at that time settled in Western Turkestan. He started his journey in 138 B C. It was a rather adventurous affair: he had to travel through Hun territory and was taken prisoner. After ten years he was able to escape, having married a Hun princess. He continued on his way and finally reached the country of the Yüeh-chih. Unfortunately they did not show the slightest inclination to fight the Huns again. Chang K'ien therefore did not obtain a satisfactory answer and started on his way back. Again he was captured in the country of the Huns, again he escaped and returned to China after fourteen years' absence.

The actual purpose of his trip was not fulfilled, but from another view-point the journey was of immeasurable importance. Chang K'ien was in a position to supply the Chinese Emperor, for the first time, with more detailed information concerning the nations of the West.

The report on his travels is still extant. It is a reliable and trustworthy basis for our knowledge concerning the tribes living beyond the western borders of China. The book served for a long time as a guide to those Chinese who desired to tour the western countries.

A more detailed knowledge concerning the western nations proved to be of great advantage to the Chinese. Trade connections were established with the West via the Tarim valley, especially when the Huns for a while discontinued to threaten the Chinese empire.

Chang K'ien had suggested to the Emperor that he should contact the Wu-sun to aid him in his war against the ancient foe; the Emperor accepted and Chang K'ien travelled to the West for the second time. During the next decades the Huns suffered several defeats and at the same time were involved in internal struggles. Consequently the war against the Huns came to an end at about 35 B.C., at least for the time being, and the Chinese were able to extend their sphere of influence far to the West.

At about the same time the Roman Empire attempted to extend its sway further towards the East. Thus China came in contact with the first power of the then known western hemisphere. The intermediary link was represented by Syria. Chinese silk especially became famous in the West and an extensive trade developed on the great caravan roads through Central Asia to deliver this much desired article to the buyers.

Merchandise from the West found its way into China in a like manner.

Obviously, the trade between the East and the West completely depended upon the political conditions in the Tarim valley. After Chang K'ien's travels, and still more after the military expeditions to Ferghana conducted by general Li Kuang-li in 104 and 102 B.C., the Tarim valley was subject to Chinese control. At the beginning of the Christian era, however, the Chinese Empire had become so weak that a number of independent states developed in the Tarim valley. They were approximately thirty in number, the more important being Kashgar, Aksu, Khotan, Kucha, Karashahr, Turfan, and Loulan. Westward of these states was Ferghana and southward the empire of the 'Great Yüeh-chih.' In the north of the small Tarim valley states we still find the old enemies, the Huns, continuosly threatening their neighbors in the South and subjecting them.

Political conditions slowly became so insecure that the traffic on the roads through the Tarim valley died down temporarily until the Chinese succeeded to force the Huns back, at least for a short while, through military expedi-

tions, and to subject the small states in the West to Chinese control. Inspite of these efforts, the overland trade connections were again severed by new wars in about 105 A.C., and from that time on business and trade between the West and China were transacted through maritime traffic.

The Yüeh-chih played a very important role as mediators between the East and the West. They were of a mentality quite different from that of the tribes who had been their former neighbors. Unlike the Huns, who never erected permanent domiciles at any place, the Yüeh-chih founded fixed settlements comparatively early. They were tradesmen and liked peace. Once they had gained power in Northern India they quickly adjusted themselves to the new cultural environment. For the same reason, they did not show any interest in fighting the Huns for the benefit of the Chinese; they realized that this would only jeopardize the growth and independence of their state.

One of their sub-clans were the Kushans whose chieftain Kadphises succeeded in gaining a leading position among the other tribal chiefs. He is the founder of the well-known Kushan dynasty which stands at the beginning of a glori-

ous period of Indian history. Still more famous than Kadphises is one of his successors, Kanishka, a ruler of unusual talents. He fostered Buddhism to a very large extent. Just at this time Buddhism underwent serious internal changes accompanied by a noticeable literary activity.

Unfortunately we know very little about the origin and real causes of those basic changes in Buddhism which lead to the development of Mahāyāna. This lack of information is especially deplorable as Mahāyāna Buddhism has spread rapidly and has (represented by various schools and sects) found its way from Northern India to Central Asia, to China, and from there to Korea and to Japan, deeply influencing the religious and cultural development of all these nations.

The time during which the Yüeh-chih ruled in Northern India is marked by a full development of Buddhism. As stated above, the political influence of the Yüeh-chih extended far into Central Asia, and consequently we find a vivid traffic between North-Western India and the adjacent countries on one side and the Tarim valley on the other. Many Indians as well as members of the Yüeh-chih and other tribes moved

to Central Asia and settled there. Buddhism soon began to flourish in these areas. Monasteries and other religious buildings were erected in large numbers. Within a short time Buddhism became known in China and was hailed as a new religious belief with great enthusiasm. As the Chinese did not have any religion in the strict sense of the word, religious conflicts were impossible in the beginning. The situation was quite similar to the later development in Japan, where Buddhism found its way from China via Korea. The Japanese Emperors favoured the new religion in every respect and encouraged its spreading; for Shintoism and Buddhism can well exist side by side. Difficulties arose only later when certain monks used their influence and reputation to interfere in political matters or otherwise caused excitement among one or the other group of the population.

During the following centuries, Chinese Buddhists have on several occasions taken the trouble of travelling all the way through Central Asia to visit the Buddhist sites in Northern India and to bring Buddhist books from there home to China. Some of these pilgrims have written accounts of their travels. Just like the

book of Chang K'ien mentioned above, these travel accounts are of extreme value: they not only furnish details of information concerning the countries forming intermediary links between the East and the West, they also contribute considerably towards an exact and well-fixed chronology of the political and cultural development of India.

Such travel accounts of Fa-hsien, Sung-yün and Hsüan-tsang have come down to us.

Fa-hsien came to India at about 400 A.D. He started his trip in Ch'ang-an, the ancient Chinese capital in Shensi (later called Si-nang-fu), and took the southern route through Khotan and Kashgar. The journey was especially difficult and dangerous when he travelled through the Indus valley, where he could hardly find a path through the wild mountains and had to cross the Indus river on hanging bridges made of ropes. On the way back, Fa-hsien travelled by sea via Ceylon and Java, which was probably still more dangerous than the land route, and returned to China after an adventurous voyage, in 414 A.D.

About one hundred years later, Sung-yün made his pilgrimage to India. He started in Lo-

yang, later called Ho-nan-fu, and also used the southern road through Khotan.

The travel account of Hsüan-tsang is the most detailed and therefore most valuable. He left Ch'ang-an in 625 A.D. and returned to China sixteen years later. Both ways he used the land route, going to India by the northern road via Yenki, Kucha, Tashkend, Samarkand and Kabul, and returning to China by the southern road through Kashgar and Khotan.

He describes his long journey in simple prose, stressing things that seemed most noteworthy to him as a Chinaman and a Buddhist. About Kucha for example he writes the following:

'Kucha abounds in millet, wheat, rice, grapes, pomegranates, pears, plums, peaches, and apricots. It also produces gold, copper, iron-ore, lead and tin. The climate is fair. The people are honest. The alphabet is Indian, but it shows noticeable change. The people are very skilled in music. They have all kinds of woolen clothing, cut their hair short, and wear turbans. They use golden, silver and copper coins. Their king was a man from Kucha, not very intelligent and completely dependent upon his influential minister. In the land of Kucha there are

more than one hundred monasteries with approximately five thousand monks, etc. etc.'

We have yet to mention another Chinese pilgrim: the famous I-tsing, who travelled in India from 671 to 695 and to whom we are indebted for very valuable accounts concerning the conditions in India. I-tsing was chiefly interested to see Buddhist buildings (stūpas, monasteries, shrines etc.) as well as the centres of science and learning, always eager to find connections with the Buddhist faith. He devoted special attention to the science of medicine and allotted much space in his travel account to the discussion of this subject. In many cases he makes reference to Chinese medicine in order to illustrate things by comparison. I-tsing travelled by sea both ways. Consequently we do not hear anything from him concerning Central Asia. In this respect, Hsüan-tsang remains our first source of information.

Numerous Chinese biographies of Buddhist monks living in Central Asia furnish us with a vivid picture of Buddhist life in the cities and towns of the Tarim valley. The cultural activity in this country is also proved by the innumerable Chinese translations of Sanskrit texts made

by Buddhist scholars of this region.

It must be admitted of course, that the Chinese pilgrims as well as the authors of Buddhist texts were only interested in Buddhism and therefore one-sided: they did not pay much attention to anything other than their religious literature. Nevertheless we find some details deserving attention from a historical viewpoint. The biography of Kumārajīva, one of the most famous translators of Sanskrit texts into Chinese, contains an account on the punitive expedition conducted by general Lü-kuang in Kucha. Kumārajīva who lived in Kucha at the time got mixed up in the trouble, was taken prisoner by Lü-kuang and brought to the Chinese capital Ch'ang-an: for Lü-kuang thought that a man of his knowledge was needed more in Ch'ang-an than in secluded Kucha. The monk was therefore taken to Ch'ang-an without being questioned for his consent. Lü-kuang also believed that a famous man like Kumārajīva should not remain without offspring, and therefore gave him a number of wives; according to the biography, they were 'ten harlots'. Kumārajīva died at the age of 70 in 413 in Ch'ang-an, after a life full of fruitful literary activity.

We have stated above that two hundred

years later, when Hsüan-tsang travelled through Central Asia, Kucha was still a center of brisk cultural and religious development, and the same is true for the other cities in the Tarim valley.

The accounts of the Chinese are substantiated by excavations conducted in the areas concerned, and the findings have in many respects completed and enlarged our hitherto rather scanty knowledge.

In as much as Central Asia was the destination of many Indian emigrants during the first centuries of the Christian era, it was to be anticipated that research work in Central Asia would contribute greatly to our knowledge of the early relations between India and the East.

In the beginning there were only stray finds which drew the attention of wider circles of scholars to the ancient cultural metropoles of the Tarim valley. In 1890 two Turks discovered a birch-bark manuscript in the vicinity of Qum-Tura and sold it to a British officer named Bower in Kucha. This so-called Bower Manuscript is written in a North Indian alphabet and dates from the fourth century A.D., as was determined later. It contains a medical text entitled Nāvanītaka.

Two years after that, Mr. Dutreuil de Rhins, a French traveller, bought two birch-bark pamphlets in Khotan. This manuscript is still older, dating from the second century after Christ. The alphabet used is the so-called Kharoṣṭhī, which had been known until then only from inscriptions found in North-Western India. The manuscript contains a fragment of the Buddhist canon in a middle-Indian dialect (Prākṛta). Another part of the same manuscript had, by the way, somehow been brought to St. Petersburg.

Both finds caused extreme excitement, as the oldest manuscripts in India proper are not older than the 11th century A.C. and even these are very rare. Everything before this time has been completely ruined by the climate or the insects. In Central Asia, however, the loess sand has little by little covered the fragments of old manuscripts, thus conserving them to this day.

It seemed likely that systematical excavations would result in interesting findings. Consequently, several countries sent expeditions of scholars to Chinese Turkestan. In 1898, the Russians started an expedition headed by

Klementz, to dig in Turfan. M. A. Stein, an archaeologist working under orders of the Indian Government, travelled twice to Central Asia during the first decade of this century. The first time he visited Khotan, the second time he went far more eastward conducting his excavations with wonderful results, especially in Tun-huang. From 1905 until 1913, the German Government sponsored three expeditions headed by Grünwedel and Le Coq, both of whom were able to send plentiful material from Turfan and Kucha to Germany. The French also worked from 1906 until 1907 in the vicinity of Tun-huang. Their expedition was headed by Pelliot and just as successful as the aforesaid. Last, not least, the Japanese headed by Otani participated in these excavations and were rewarded by valuable finds.

Thus large quantities of varied material were obtained by the museums and libraries in St. Petersburg, Delhi, London, Oxford, Berlin, Paris and Tokyo.

The biggest part of the documents found was of Buddhist origin, as had of course been expected. Occasionally however, other documents were discovered. In Niya (East of

Khotan) for example, the British expedition found a large number of documents written on leather or wood, in a refuse dump or rubbish pile. Some of the documents were still tied together and exhibiting seals, partly showing Greek deities, chiefly Pallas Athene, and partly Chinese characters. The leather documents are dated, but only by days and months. The alphabet is in all cases Kharoṣṭhī, a script running from right to left, as has been mentioned above in connection with the manuscripts acquired by Dutreuil de Rhins. Here too, the language is a late form of Prākṛta.

The documents chiefly concern administrative matters as well as contracts of a more private nature, law suits, letters, legal agreements and so forth. Although they are not dated by years, we are able to fix their date approximately, as together with them Chinese documents have been found, one of which is dated. We therefore can assign these documents to the middle of the third century A.C.

The proper names occurring therein are in most cases Indian, the titles of the officials partly Indian, partly non-Indian. The evidence proves that the vicinity of Khotan was

inhabited by Indian colonists, who migrated from Taxila. This is corroborated by the seals exhibiting Greek deities done in the style of Greek-Baktrian art as we know it from the North-Western frontier of India.

Finds such as have been made in Niya are of course rarities. As stated above, the bulk of the manuscripts is Buddhist. Buddhist religious centers were spread all over the country, wherever conditions permitted their establishment. In addition to artificial buildings in the plains and valleys of the rivers we also find natural rock caves used as Buddhist sites of worship. Some of these caves were artificially enlarged and decorated, and in general are very similar to those found in Afghanistan, in the Bamian valley. They abound with sculptures and paintings depicting the Buddha and his attendants or scenes from the Buddha legend. Together with these paintings we find most beautiful flower ornaments. Paintings showing the dedicators claim our special attention, as they differ in style widely from the religious pictures. As far as possible, these paintings have been removed by the archaeologists together with the sculptures and taken to their respective homelands where they represent

the most valuable treasures of the museums. It was thus possible to reconstruct complete buildings to give interested persons in Europe an idea of this admirable art in the heart of Asia.

The art represented by these paintings is of course not without modifications. Varying according to the geographical situation of the sites and the nationality of the local population, it is influenced either by the West or by the East. The main style, however, exhibits a strictly Western character. The Gandhāra style can be easily recognized. This style of art received its name from the Gandhāra country stretching between the Southern banks of Kabul river and the Hindukush. Gandhāra was of the utmost importance, due to its situation on the gate of India and populated by Indian tribes. Soon after the beginning of the Christian era, a new style of art, chiefly religious, was developed in Gandhāra. The basis of this style was taken from the later Greek art, but clearly modified by Indian characteristics. The Buddha type, later accepted by all Asian countries, was developed in Gandhāra. When the Indians immigrated into Central Asia, the Gandhāra art was transplanted to the Tarim valley.

In the course of time, especially under the Uigür rule, the style of art changed considerably by absorbing Chinese elements, thus developing into a new religious art of a mixed character.

The finds of Buddhist manuscripts have in quantity and quality surpassed all expectations. First of all we have Sanskrit texts, which are unfortunately in most cases fragmentary and require an extreme amount of patience and skill for their reconstruction. Unlike our modern and usually rather faulty manuscripts, these texts are based on sound textual tradition and come partly either very close to the dates of the archetype or are even contemporaneous with the latter. In addition to these originals we have also translations of such texts into a large number of languages, e.g. Tibetan, Chinese, Khotanese, Tocharian, Uigurian etc. This proves better than anything else the diversity of peoples and nations coming from all parts of Asia and meeting in the Tarim valley as a powerful congregation of the Buddhist faith which united them all, or at least the larger part of them.

Fortunately the excavations have also widened our knowledge concerning other religious systems that had followers in Central Asia during

the period under review. Especially the research in regard to the religious faith of Mani has here received very important and valuable evidence.

Before, we knew about Mani only from the writings of his antagonists. The most important among them are Augustinus (4th century A.C.), who himself had been a Manichean for nine years of his life, and Muḥammad Ibn Ishāq (10th century A.C.) whose work is based on older accounts,

Mani was born in about 215 A. C. in Babylon. Soon after he first began to preach in public, he was forced to leave his homeland. He went to Eastern Iran and from there to Turkestan. Later he returned to Persia, thinking that conditions there would be more favorable than they used to be before. He was however persecuted and finally crucified. His religious system is based on the dualism of light and darkness.

It is very noteworthy that many Manichean books have been preserved in Central Asia; for the followers of Mani were persecuted in most other places and their books destroyed by all possible means. Central Asia has furnished us with some books which apparently go back to Mani personally, e.g. the fragments from the *Shābūrakān*, from the Gospels and the Epistles.

Besides we have found numerous hymns, penitential formulae and similar pieces, for example the *Khuastuanift*, a confession of sins by the Manichean Auditores, which was unearthed in Tun-huang. All these books supply valuable details concerning the Manichean doctrine.

The language of these documents is Middle-Persian, Sogdian, Uigurian, in some cases even Chinese. All of these Manichean books from Central Asia are noteworthy for their neat handwriting and their numerous illustrations after the fashion of miniatures. It is known from literary sources too, that the Manicheans used to pay great attention to the decoration of their religious writings. Thus we read in one of Augustinus' letters: 'Tam multi et tam grandes et tam pretiosi codices vestri—incendite omnes illas membranas elegantesque tecturas decoribus exquisitas',...(You have so many bulky and valuable books—burn all of those beautiful bindings and fancy book-covers!)

A third religious system that came to Central Asia from the West and from there even to China was the sect of the Nestorian Christians which had respectable numbers of followers even in the Far East. The central points of

their teachings were concerned with certain conceptions relative to the person of Christ. The East-Syrian Church accepted the views of Nestorians and severed the connections with the West-Syrian Church. Nestorianism later migrated to Persia, to Arabia, and to India, where the so-called Thomas-Christians first recognized the superiority of the Metropolitan of Persia, and from there to Central Asia and China, where Nestorian families immigrated from 578 A. C. onwards.

In Tun-huang in Eastern Turkestan two Nestorian fragments in Chinese have been found, while six other documents, also in Chinese, were discovered in China proper. It is believed that these too originated in Tun-huang. Two more pieces, one of which was found in Turfan, the other in Peking, are written in Syrian. These fragments date from the beginning of the 7th century until the beginning of the 9th century A.C.

The most valuable relic of Nestorian missionary activity is the great Chinese rock inscription, at the present time preserved in Sinangfu. Formerly it belonged to a site westward of Sinangfu in the yard of some Buddhist monas-

tery. The inscription furnishes details concerning Nestorian missions during the 7th and 8th centuries A.C., and contains approximately seventy Syrian words and expressions.

The manuscripts found in Central Asia are also of the greatest importance to linguists. When studying materials found in the vicinity of Turfan scholars detected documents written in a known alphabet, the Indian Brāhmī, but in an unknown language. Shortly after that, it was discovered that this new and until then mysterious language was split into two dialects, called A and B for the time being. The A-dialect apparently represents the literary language: all documents of the A-dialect are Buddhist. The B-dialect on the other hand was also used for other purposes, for example passports written on pieces of wood.

This new language is the Tocharian, for thus it was called by the Uigurs. It belongs to the Indo-European family of languages. The discovery of Tocharian gave rise to a number of problems which have not all been solved as yet. It was right away ascertained that from a linguistic viewpoint the Tocharian language does not at all fit into the farthest East, where it was

found, for it bears a number of characteristics usually attributed to the western branches of the Indo-European languages. Even the designation 'Tokharian' offers some problems.

The division of the Indo-European languages into two separate groups is based on the representation of certain sounds by the members of each group, as well as on grammatical and lexicographical characteristics. Of the better known languages, Greek, Latin, Celtic, Germanic belong to the Western Group, while Indian, Iranian, Slavian form the Eastern Group. Thus one should assume that the Tocharian language would exhibit characteristics of the Eastern Group of the Indo-European languages, due to the fact that it was spoken in Central Asia. The Tocharian language however did not show this favour to linguists. It definitely belongs to the Western Group. I will present a few examples to prove this point:

The word denoting 'hundred' is '*känd*' in Tocharian, quite similar to Latin '*centum*', while in Sanskrit we have '*śatam*', in Avesta '*satəm*', in Lithuanian '*szimtas*', all starting with an *s*-sound which represents the *k*-sound of the Western Group of the Indo-European languages.

'Twenty' is in Tocharian '*wiki*', as in Latin '*viginti*' while Sanskrit has '*viṃśati*'. In regard to verbal inflection the Tocharian is noteworthy for the formations of the passive voice through an *r*-suffix. '*träṅktär*' means '*dicitur*' = 'it is being said' ('he says' = *träṅkaṣ* = '*dicit*'); this is an astonishing affinity to the Latin as well as Celtic languages where we also meet with the *r*-forms for the passive. The Tocharian vocabulary also shows a striking similarity with that of the languages of the Western Group. The numeral denoting 'one' is in Tocharian '*sam*', which has been compared with the first part of Latin '*sem-el*' = 'once'. 'Fire' is in Tocharian '*por*', almost like Greek πῦρ or Oscian Umbrian '*pūr*', while the word found in Sanskrit is '*agni*'. 'Salt' is in Tocharian '*sal*', 'milk' is '*malk*' etc. etc.

It remains a mystery how this language that bears so many characteristics of the Western Group has been transplanted to the East: we do not even know when this happened. Nor do we know which part of the Tocharians were called 'Toχri' by the Uigurs, or which language they spoke. It is most certainly not the language of the Tocharian nation mentioned in literary

tradition which settled around 130 B.C. in Bactria, nor is it the language of the Indo-Scythians. The expression 'Toχri' comes, as has been stated above, from an Uigurian literary source, while in the texts themselves the language is once referred to as the 'ārśi-tongue'. These Ārśi have undoubtedly correctly been identified with the Asioi mentioned by Strabo and with the 'Asiani, reges Thogarorum' of Trojus Pompejus.

There is furthermore little doubt that the Ārśi are identical with the Yüeh-chih; it has even been conjectured that the Chinese expression 'Yüeh-chih' is in its ancient pronunciation nothing but a phonetic rendering of the name Ārśi.

Another so-far unknown language appearing in many documents from Turkestan, chiefly from the vicinity of Khotan, is the Saka tongue, an Iranian language, which originally belongs to the West and came to the East but later. The literary documents found have been assigned to the period from the 7th to the 10th century A.C., and consist mainly in translations of Buddhist Sanskrit texts together with a few medical texts. The alphabet is Brāhmī.

Turkish languages have also profited greatly from the excavations in Central Asia. The Uigurian Turks or the Uigurs proper originally lived in Mongolia and were either related or identical with the Hiung-nu. About 760 A.C. they founded a powerful empire in Eastern Turkestan, which lasted until the invasion of the Mongols in the 13th century. Uigurian manuscripts have been found in Turfan, in Miran as well as in areas situated further to the East, in Tun-huang, and in Etsen-goh in Kansu. The most ancient documents are inscriptions, written in some kind of runes. These runes also occasionally appear in manuscripts. The normal Uigurian alphabet is however related to the Sogdian script, for the Uigurs in Central Asia first established contact with Iranian and Sogdian tribes and from there obtained their information concerning the religions as well as the literatures of the West. While the majority of the Uigurian nation accepted the Buddhist faith, their kings were followers of the teachings of Mani.

Their script runs from right to left in parallel horizontal lines; later these lines were written in a vertical direction similar to the

Chinese mode of writing. This Uigurian alphabet and script is the basis for the later Mongolian and Manchu scripts.

There were also intimate connections between Central Asia and Tibet. Tibetans must have lived in large numbers in Central Asia since Tibetan documents have been found in numerous places, chiefly in the Cave of the Thousand Buddhas in Tun-huang. These documents go back to the eighth century, that is not quite a hundred years later than the invention of the Tibetan script, which was developed from an Indian alphabet.

Thus the documents found in Central Asia prove already by the variety of the languages used, that the population of the Tarim valley must have been of a mixed character. The same is true for the various religious systems and creeds. At one time the Buddhists were in the majority, but split in the two great schools of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, each of which again comprised many sub-sects. Besides, there were the other religious systems mentioned above. They all lived peacefully side by side.

This condition did not prevail for ever, for finally the Arabs penetrated into Central Asia

and introduced Islam, which practices another type of missionary activity and does not tolerate any religion by its side. During the 10th century, the Arabs had started to sail from the Persian Gulf to China and founded Islamic communities in various places along the coasts of the Asian mainland. Soon after they also gained footholds in the Tarim valley and increased their influence considerably under the Mongolian rule.

When Marco Polo travelled to Khotan across the Pamir mountains via Kashgar, Samarkand and Yarkand in the 13th century, the Mongols were already the masters of the country and the population almost completely Mohammedan. The Nestorian Christians still had a few communities here and there with churches of their own. Buddhism, however, had been completely forgotten. Marco Polo does not even mention this religious system which had been the ruling creed for many centuries in the Tarim Valley.

SPREAD OF BUDDHISM

Buddhism in India as religion or as philosophy of life has now no more the great importance it possessed for a long time. Buddhism, however, belongs to India and bears the characteristic features of Indian mind and spirit. That after many centuries it was slowly pushed backwards and lost its importance is due to the power of the old Indian tradition and to the authority of *the Indian book*, the Veda. Buddhism, however, did not deny the Veda nor the Vedic gods. It even allotted to them an important part, which is to protect Buddhism everywhere and to punish those who abuse and insult it or its followers. Yet the fact that Buddha did not appreciate the Veda and its thoughts and perceptions which are logically carried on and deepened in the Upanishads as the fundament of all knowing caused the fate of its doctrine in India.

With astonishing sharpness the representatives of Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā were controverting against Buddhism. In their discussions they

were extremely skillful and beat the Buddhists with their own words. Thus e.g. Kumārila, an especially well-talented and ready-witted disputant, says:

'The doctrine the Śākyas have established, that is, that all is but momentary, is abandoned by them, when they say, that after the manner of the Veda their own tradition is everlasting'. Or: 'The Bauddhas .... finding no cogent arguments to bring forward against the Mīmāṃsakas, they lose their heart by having to fall back upon the device of repeating the arguments of the opponent; and having no reasons of their own to bring forward, they say: 'Our scriptures are eternal'—forgetting in this all their own former declarations .... The Buddha has laid down the momentary character of all things that are brought into existence; such a text of the Bauddhas being—'All saṃskāras are momentary...'

The opponents of Buddhism restricted themselves not only to a formal disproof of the Buddhist perceptions and sentences, they also brought up other arguments. Before all they took offence at the language of the Buddhist scriptures. They maintained that the books of

the Bauddhas are full of dialectic expressions and wrong forms, and give a row of examples; but the Veda, they say, is written in the only beautiful and right language. Kumārila also accuses the founder of Buddhism of being of the warrior class and not a Brāhmaṇa. He says:

'Then again, we find that the Bauddha teachings are given by one who was a born Kṣatriya; and as such, he transgressed the duties of his own class, in taking up himself the works of teaching and receiving presents (which are the monopoly of the Brāhmaṇas); and hence how can we believe that true Dharma and Duty would be taught by one, who transgresses his own Dharma?'

It was a long and hard fight the scholars of Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā lead against the Buddhist and these as well against their adversaries. But it was a fight with peaceful weapons. It never came to a real hard persecution of the Buddhists, as in Tibet, China or Korea. What, occasionally, is said about it is either exaggerated or not true at all.

But in spite of the fact that they only used spiritual weapons the success of the followers of the Vedānta was great.

Formally regarded Buddhism was repressed in India. Essentially that is right. But one can also take Buddhism to have been absorbed by Brahmanism to a certain degree. If one objectively compares the doctrine of Brahmanism on one side and of Buddhism on the other, one will see that in reality the main ideas of Buddhism have not been new at all. But before all, and that is of special importance, the adherents of Buddhism, if they were not just versed in dialectics possibly could not sharply decide between the idea of Nirvāṇa or Bodhi on the one side and that of Ātman-Brahman on the other side, on account of the fact that the words with which the Ātman is praised in the Upanishads are often quite the same as those with which the Buddhist monks and poets extol the Nirvāṇa. One may add that the representatives of Vedānta got their tools and implements partly from the famous Buddhist philosophers, while the Buddhist philosophers used the dialectics of the Brahmans. Indeed Śaṃkara himself was called a 'disguised Bauddha' (*pracchanna-Bauddha*). But the Vedāntists had a great advantage. That was the possession of the precious good of tradition, the Veda, which stands

at the beginning of Indian history and Indian culture, even of the whole Indo-European culture and which did find its natural continuation in the Upanishads. Thus one can almost say that Buddhism in a certain way was absorbed again by Hinduism because a lot was the same or yet rather similar and in many cases, and with other words and reasons, could be easily assumed. On the other side one should not forget that there happened many conversions from Brahmanism to Buddhism. And it were just the most talented men among the Buddhist philosophers who did defend the doctrine of the Brahmans in former times. Thus it becomes clear that they could reach such a high art of discussion and such a sharpness of thinking and could work for strengthening, deepening and reasoning out the Buddhist doctrines.

For the weakening of Buddhism one fact is of great importance. The Buddhist community did not remain a union compact in itself. Already soon after the death of Buddha, it came to schisms which naturally caused a slow diminution of strength of the Buddhist communion These differences of opinion did, however, concern the doctrine less than the discipline of the order.

Reading the corresponding parts of the Buddhist scriptures one is rather surprised and hardly can believe that things which appear to us quite unimportant could lead to such great differences which regularly caused schisms. Our knowledge of these fights among the Buddhists is rather incomplete, and we know even less from the reports of non-Buddhistic works. Often we know of the schisms by the difference in names, without knowing the exact distinction that differentiates them from each other. Small differences often lead to hard fights and schisms. It is so with regard to other religious communities also. Concerning such discrepancies within the Buddhist community we possess very important testimonies in the edicts of Emperor Aśoka. They are of an especially high value to us because they reach back to real conditions as well as their exact time can be ascertained, which is the middle of the 3rd century before Christ. Thus Aśoka says in the 12th Rock-Edict that the requisition for the growing of inner qualities is before all guarding one's speech; one should at an improper opportunity neither praise one's own sect nor blame other sects. Aśoka says : 'if somebody behaves like that he

only hurts his own sect severely'. In another edict (the Sanchi Pillar Edict) there is a direct reference to schisms within the order of monks. 'The order', it is said there, 'is not to be divided. The order of monks and nuns shall be united as long as my sons and great-grandsons rule and as long as sun and moon are shining. But the monk or nun who breaks up the community must be caused to put on white garments and to reside at a place forbidden for monks. For it is my wish that the order be united and exist for a long time.'

Unfortunately the troubles of Emperor Aśoka were not rewarded and the schism in schools progressed more and more.

But at the time when quite a new conception of the very foundations of the Buddhist faith arose, it came to a schism of much greater consequences, compared with which, the other quarrels paled into insignificance. The time during which Mahāyāna, as a special school besides the older Buddhism which was now called Hīnayāna, came forward as an almost independent perception of the world, lies in complete darkness; for soon after the period of Emperor Aśoka up to a long period after the beginning of the Christian

era we have no definite dates in Indian history and are restricted to surmises. Thus we do not know exactly when the main promulgators of the new doctrine started working and, before all, and which is more regrettable, we do not know the true reasons which lead to the new form of Buddhism. Yet here we shall not concern ourselves with these difficult problems, but see how Buddhism was more widely spread over the northern hemisphere and brought there Indian things.

In the centuries after the birth of Christ we find many Indians in Central Asia, without being able to prove the reason for their migration. They were mostly Buddhists, that is followers of both the schools, Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, who settled on both sides of the Tarim river. In Indian literature nothing is mentioned about these facts, and we would not have known much about them, if the settlements had not been excavated in quite modern times. Everywhere one finds places of Buddhist worship, houses, temples in the form of caves, etc. Enormous material, e.g. sculpture, painting and texts, has been brought to light. The manuscripts discovered are of the highest value, for they are the oldest manuscripts we possess of Indian works.

Buddhism made its way from Central Asia to China and from there to Korea and finally to Japan. It is rather interesting to see how the different countries with their population and government, quite different in character and way of life, responded to the Indian doctrine.

As regards China the situation was as follows. As soon as Buddhism became known, that may have been some time after the beginning of the Christian era, it was received enthusiastically. There seems to have been felt a real need for a religion of the kind of Buddhism, which complemented, as it were, Confucianism which was of an ethical character rather than religious. Buddhism corresponded in a high measure to the mind and mentality of a large number of educated Chinese.

But though many Chinese Buddhists, with the assistance of Indian scholars, built up a big number of convents and communities and expended immense energy in translating and commenting Buddhist Sanskrit texts, Buddhism never made China its uncontested home and never ran fluid with typical Chinese way of thinking. Buddhism could not restrain Confucianism. Indeed after a long period of prosperity and growth

Buddhism in China had finally the same fate as in India. In India Buddhism could not stand Vedānta and in China it had to give way to Confucianism. The Emperor Wu Tsung decreed in the year 845 A.C. the pulling down of the 4600 convents and the 40000 religious buildings in the Empire and ordered that the 260000 monks and nuns should adopt secular life. No Buddhist priest was allowed to have more than one pupil.

Later Emperors, however, showed themselves very tolerant or even promoted Buddhism as in older times and were interested in Buddhist literature and in its preservation.

There are altogether 12 collections of the Chinese translations of Buddhist texts made by order of Chinese Emperors. Thus it is stated in the Annals of the Sui dynasty (which covers the time from 589 to 618 A.C.) that Emperor Wu, who reigned from 502 to 549, paid great honour to Buddhism and made a collection of 5400 volumes of Buddhist books in the Hua-lin garden. The Buddhist priest Pao-chang compiled a catalogue of this collection by Imperial order in the year 518. This catalogue, however, has been lost. Not much time later, during

the years 533 to 534 Emperor Hsiao-wu of the Northern Wei dynasty made a new collection of Buddhist works, and so on. The last collection was made by the Emperors Shih-tsung and Kao-tsung during the years 1735 and 1737.

A large number of Chinese accepted wholeheartedly Buddhist religion and often with great enthusiasm. Chinese pilgrims like Fa-hsien, Sung-yün, Hsüen-tsang, I-tsing and many others suffered perils and dangers on the long journey to India just to obtain Buddhist texts and to visit Buddhist holy places in India.

These visits to India became important also from another point of view. A lot of Indian culture and things came along with Buddhism over Central Asia to China and even further. The growing connections between India and China would have been impossible without Buddhism. The Chinese pilgrims acquired knowledge of Indian conditions and naturally made them known in their own country.

Their reports about India are of course of great value to us. However, they are not as comprehensive as they might have been. For in the same way as in former times Christian missionaries, who went out to India or to other

places, were interested only in preaching the Gospel and often did not care much about other things holding them to be of small value or even of no value at all, the Chinese pilgrims were interested only in Buddhism, to which they had devoted themselves. Notwithstanding, some important dates and facts of Indian history are known only from the books of the Chinese authors. There was a great difference between the historical writings of India on the one hand and of China on the other. For reasons which are not discussed here there was but little interest in India to transmit historical facts to future generations. Thus it is that we possess very few certain dates of older Indian times. And these few dates we owe only to especially favourable circumstances. We could not determine the time of Emperor Aśoka, had he not himself given the names of some Greek kings in his thirteenth Rock Edict. And only by the fact that Aśoka's time could be fixed it has become possible to settle the year of Gotama Buddha's Nirvāṇa with approximate certainty.

We know very little about Indian history during a considerable time before and after Christ. This is especially regrettable as concerns

the period of Emperor Kaniṣka, his predecessors and successors. For that time was highly important and decisive for the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

About Central Asia, during the first centuries after Christ, we should also know as much as nothing if Fa-hsien and Hsüen-tsang and a few more would not have written down their journeys. Thus these reports give us very important information about Central Asia though the main emphasis is put on things Buddhist.

It has been mentioned that already in early times in China Buddhist texts were collected and even catalogues of them were compiled. This corresponds to the Chinese mentality to preserve literature and to hand it down in well-arranged collections to future generations. Some of the older catalogues of Buddhist works, however, are lost; but we still possess 13 of them, which are of the greatest importance. The earliest extant catalogue was compiled in the year 520 and mentions 2213 distinct Buddhist books, whilst the youngest catalogue dates from the year 1600, containing the titles of about 1600 works, which are all extant.

There are altogether 14 printed editions of

the Chinese Tripiṭaka, in which all the extant works are collected, the first edition dating from the year 972 A.C. Eight other editions have appeared in China upto the year 1869. In Korea, too, one edition was published in 1010. In Japan four editions have been printed, the earliest during the years 1624 to 1643. The last edition appeared during the years 1924 to 1930 and is known as the Taishō Issaikyō. This excellent edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka consists of 83 volumes in quarto, each volume containing about 1000 pages. The number of works collected in it is 3098.

The order of the texts in the different editions is not the same. In most cases the texts, both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, are grouped under Sūtra, Vinaya and Abhidharma; but then follows a large supplement containing independent Chinese books on other Buddhist subjects.

It is interesting and instructive to see how the Chinese treated the Indian language while translating a Sanskrit text. Because both Chinese and Indian are very different in structure, one can imagine, how difficult it must have been for the Chinese to master the erudite tomes in Sanskrit. The Chinese always were and are

anxious to use good style in writing. The first translations, which the Chinese monks as well as immigrated and Chinese-speaking Indians made from Buddhist Sanskrit texts, were almost literal renderings of the Indian originals. This principle the Tibetans also followed in their translations from Sanskrit. Yet the Chinese gave it up because with literal translations they had to force the Chinese idiom, and that created a bad style. Therefore the later translations are rather free and in general show a good style. More difficult for the Chinese was the transliteration of Indian names, words and sentences. That happened rather often, especially when dealing with the countless magic verses or syllables (dhāraṇī), which were only effective when spoken in the right intonation and form. The Chinese had perforce to use their own characters for the transcription of Sanskrit words. Many phonetic difficulties arose. We know a number of systems for transcribing Sanskrit sounds. They were so impracticable that they were never really used. The simple system of transcribing whole syllables with one character was preferred though the result of such a transcription could never have been quite satisfactory.

Buddhism came from China to Japan not directly but via Korea. Thus, Korea played an important part concerning the expansion of Buddhism from India to Japan. The history of Korea, which is in our days the most named country of Asia, is rather complicated. During the time which is of interest to us it is essentially that of three towns and provinces, Korai in the north, Pekche in the west and Silla in the east. These three states were founded during the first part of the first century after Christ. One can say that during the first 600 years of the Christian era the history of Korea is the history of these three provinces. During the following 400 years it is the history of Silla. Pekche soon got the leading position in cultural life. It was the old Chinese culture which was accepted in Korea and kept up its leading position in most domains of intellectual life. The presence of many Chinese who left China for various reasons and settled down in this peninsula gave to Chinese culture its importance. The Chinese classics, Confucius and Mencius, became known, first in Pekche. At the end of the fourth century Buddhism made its way to Pekche, coming from Liao-tung. In the year 384

a Buddhist missionary, the Tibetan Marananda, founded monasteri es and temples in Pekche.

All literature was written in Chinese. It was only towards the end of the seventh century, when only Silla was left as an independent state (while the other two, Korai and Pekche, had lost their sovereignty), that an unknown Korean designed a special alphabet for his language on the basis of certain Chinese characters. This first alphabet was later, in the 15th century replaced by another, which was still more sim plified. Nevertheless, Chinese remained the literary language. For one thousand years after its introduction into Korea, Buddhism had exerted its influence in many respects. Later, when Buddhist monks and monasteries began to interfere in political matters and often succeeded in gaining almost complete power over the country, serious difficulties arose and finally led to noticeable restrictions imposed on Buddhist activities. The number of Buddhist monasteries in Korea, which once was remarkably high, dwindled down to a very limited number. In 1939, there were only 7,200 Buddhist monks and nuns in a total of 24 millions of Koreans, while the number of registered Buddhist laymen amoun-

ted to 195,000.

Nevertheless, Buddhism has left deep marks on the Korean peninsula, and they are still evident.

The first country to introduce Buddhism was, as has been stated, Pekche, and not very much later Buddhist teachers and missionaries appeared in the other two states, Korai and Silla.

By its geographical position, Korea was the natural connecting link between China and Japan. The Korean states were continously held in a somewhat awkward position by the immediate vicinity of the mighty Chinese Empire. The Koreans were always dependent on China and this dependence was extremely noticeable, yet, the aforesaid states remained enemies of the Chinese almost without interruption during the course of history. This was of course especially true for Korai in the North, and this enmity between Korai and China was increased by the rival states Silla and Pekche.

Korean-Japanese relations were mainly maintained through Pekche. It was from this country that Chinese language and literature found its way to Japan. Wani, a famous Korean scholar, went to Japan in 405 A.C. and founded

schools for the teaching of Chinese and the studying of Chinese books. Until that time, the Japanese did not have an alphabet of their own; their culture in general could not compete with Chinese culture and civilisation. Consequently, the Japanese people eagerly accepted Chinese culture in all its ramifications, once Korean scholars as well as other Koreans had begun to come to Japan.

In regard to religious affairs things were quite similar. The Japanese had at that time only a few mythological conceptions which could hardly be called a system, far less a religion. At the same time, they were a very clever and inquisitive nation, exceedingly willing to accept a higher cultural standard. Buddhism was introduced to Japan during the middle of the 6th century. At that time, Pekche was threatened by Silla and Korai and therefore turned to Japan for aid. Among other gifts, the king of Pekche sent to the Japanese Emperor a picture (or statue ?) of Lord Buddha and a number of Buddhist books. The sending of this picture of Buddha right away reminds us of the famous story from the Divyāvadāna, where it is told that King Bimbisāra of Magadha presented

the King of Roruka with the picture of the 'Blessed-One'.

After a period of slow progress, Buddhism began to conquer Japan swiftly. The indigenous mythological conceptions were no obstacle to the spreading out of Buddhism, which became the religious faith of nearly the whole nation. In Japan the situation was very different from the conditions in China, where Confucianism has always been and still is so strong among the common people, that no other religious system has yet succeeded in gaining a real foothold.

There was indeed an original system of religious conceptions—if I may call it by this name—, existing in Japan: Shintoism, based on age-old mythological ideas and dominated by the worship of Amaterasu, a Sun-goddess. But there was no strife between the two religions: Shintoism and Buddhism. Both managed to live peacefully side by side. The ancient work on Japanese history entitled Nihongi reports about Emperor Yomei, who reigned towards the end of the 6th century A.C. that 'the Emperor believed in the Law of Buddha and reverenced the Way of God (Shintō).'

Japanese Buddhism is divided in numerous

sects, but even these do not show any animosity against each other, as the Japanese interpretation of Buddhism is a rather liberal one. It is in fact so liberal that Western Christianity is often looked upon as a mere variation of Buddhism.

The importance of Buddhism in Japan is illustrated by the fact that there are more than 41 millions of Buddhists among a total of 66 millions of Japanese according to the 1937 census. Buddhism is a living religion in Japan and has become inseparable from that nation. This gives us the key to the general Japanese attitude toward life as well as toward death, the famous bravery of the Samurai. It is their firm conviction that the present existence is but a short moment within the vast number of previous and future lives, which will be the happier, the more good deeds are performed by the individual. And the first place among all good deeds is of course claimed by the dedication of wealth and life to the benefit of other beings, which has been practiced so often by Buddha himself during his former existences.

Thus India-born Buddhism has had remarkable effects upon the life of the Japanese nation,

and together with Buddhism other implements of Indian culture have been introduced in Japan. It is impossible to go into details about that matter at this occasion. There is only one point to which I want to call your attention: the Japanese alphabet is, as far as the arrangement of the letters is concerned, completely Indian.

The Japanese have used certain shortened Chinese characters to develop a syllabic alphabet of their own. During the oldest period, Chinese characters with an approximately identical pronunciation were used to render certain Japanese words phonetically, if there was need to preserve them in their original forms. This method, however, proved to be completely insufficient as time went on, because it was neither regulated nor simple enough.

On the other hand, the Japanese could never get the idea of spelling the sounds of their language as we do in the European languages, i.e. by separate signs for vowels and consonants, because a Chinese character always represents a group of phonemes.

The Indian alphabets are also based on the principle that the consonants are the most important letters while the vowels are indicated by

additional signs placed above or under the consonants, inspite of the fact that consonants and vowels have, so to speak, equal rights in the Indian languages.

In the Japanese alphabet we first meet the vowels in exactly the same order as in India : *a*, *i*, *u*, *e*, *o*. Then follow the gutturals accompanied by these vowels : *ka*, *ki*, *ku*, *ke*, *ko*, and thus it goes on. The few deviations from the Indian original can be explained easily by the special features of the Japanese language.

Since Buddhism is playing a decisive role in Japan, we are not surprised to find that the Japanese have done excellent work in the field of Buddhist history and philosophy. I wish to draw your attention especially to the large encyclopedias, where you can get information about everything connected with Buddhism, for example Indian Brahmanism, the Indian pantheon, the Vedas, the Upanishads—in very detailed and well arranged articles.

There are many schools and sects of Japanese Buddhism. Among these, the Jōdo and Shin sects—both of which are based on the doctrine of 'the Pure Land' or 'Western Paradise' as taught in the Sukhāvatīvyūha—count the most numerous

followers. But others also, as the Tendai, Zen and Nichiren sects, which latter is based on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, are of great importance.

Buddhism in Japan is not mixed with magic conceptions, as has been the case in Tibet. Tibetan Buddhism is of quite a different character, which must be explained by the fact that Buddhism before entering Tibet had already undergone changes and absorbed popular conceptions especially in Kashmir and Nepal. Later they were increased still more by the magic religion of Tibet proper.

In Tibet Buddhism became known only in the first half of the 7th century A.C. during the reign of King Srong-btsan Gam-po, who died in 650. This mighty and talented king has done much to give his country a high cultural standard. Under his reign the Tibetan script was formed after the model of the North-western Indian alphabet, which was current also in Khotan.

But not before the time of his fifth successor, under Khri-srong lde-btsan was Buddhism really established in Tibet. This was done by Padmasambhava, who was called from Udyāna to Tibet. The first monastery was founded in the year 749 A.C. At the same time a great literary acti-

vity set in. Tibetan students were sent to India to learn Sanskrit and Buddhist philosophy, while Indian monks were called to Tibet.

During the latter half of the 9th century there arose a second literary activity under king Ral-pa-chan. To this period belong the well-known Indian scholars Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi, Surendrabodhi, Prajñavarman, Dānaśīla and Bodhimitra, who with the assistance of the Tibetan scholars Dpal-brtsegs, Ye-śes-sde, Chos-kyi rgyal-mthsan and others translated more than half of the Sanskrit works contained in the two large collections, Kanjur and Tanjur.

But the fact that Ral-pa-chan was too ardently devoted to Buddhism caused a strong reaction from the side of the adherents of the indigenous Tibetan religion called Bon, which essentially is a demon-charming and necromantic cult. Ral-pa-chan's brother himself, Lang darma, was the head of a Bon faction. He assassinated his brother and made himself successor to the kingship of Tibet. A violent persecution of Buddhist monks set in. Buddhist books were burnt and Buddhist monasteries were destroyed by order of the king. It is an interesting coincidence that this took place nearly at the same

time, when in China Emperor Wu Tsung decreed to pull down the Buddhist convents and buildings.

Buddhism had, however, already become too strong to be restrained and abolished. Indeed only after three years of persecution, during which Lang darma was anxious to destroy Buddhism as completely as possible, he himself was murdered by a Buddhist monk in the disguise of a Bon devil-dancer.

Buddhism was reinforced and grew in popularity and influence. In the 13th century, the Mongol Emperor Kublai Khan, whose grandfather Chingiz Khan had conquered Tibet, was converted to Buddhism by the abbot of the famous Sas-kya monastery in Western Tibet. Kublai Khan conferred the rulership of Western Tibet to Sas-kya Pandita, as that abbot is mostly called. With this the hierarchy was established in Western Tibet. Sas-kya Pandita, assisted by a great staff of scholars, achieved the translation of the Buddhist Tibetan Canon into the Mongolian language.

In the beginning of the 15th century the 'Yellow-hat' order, established in the year 1038 by the Indian monk Atīśa, was re-organized by the famous Lama Tsong-kha-pa. The monastery

of this sect, by which all the others were eclipsed, was at Gah-ldan near Lhasa. This was the beginning of the priest-kingship of the whole of Tibet.

The first Grand Lama was Geden-dub, the nephew of Tsong-kha-pa. The title of Dalai Lama was introduced in 1650, after a Mongol prince had conquered Tibet at the request of the powerful abbot of the 'Yellow-hat' church, Lob-zang rgya-mthso, and had presented it to him. The word Dalai is the Mongolian translation of Tibetan *rgya-mthso*, meaning 'ocean'.

Tibetan Buddhism has been given the name Lamaism. This name, however, may suggest that the religion of Tibet is different from Buddhism. But this is not so. The religion of Tibet is Mahāyāna Buddhism. The works of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon are nearly entirely translations of Buddhist Sanskrit texts, including books on grammar, lexicography, medicine and some others. Tibetan Buddhism, however, shows some peculiarities, as it was introduced mainly from Kashmir; thus it is mixed up with ideas which are proper to Shaivism and Tantrism. There is also some influence of the Tibetan Bon religion.

The Tibetan Buddhist Canon consists of the

above-mentioned two great collections, Kanjur and Tanjur. There are altogether about 300 big volumes, containing more than four thousand works of different length. They are printed, like the ancient Chinese books, from carved wooden tablets or blocks, called xylographs. There are several editions, prepared at different places as Narthang, Derge, Lhasa and also Peking. There exist also complete manuscripts. The best known printed edition is that made in Narthang.

We have confined ourselves to the spread of Buddhism from the North of India, though Buddhism also spread from Southern India and Ceylon to other countries as Burma, Siam, Cambodia and Indonesia. This Buddhism, based on the Pali Tripiṭaka in Ceylon, is Hīnayāna. Pali Buddhism was the first to become known in the Western world and has been studied by many scholars in Europe. But now Mahāyāna also forms a very important branch of the science of Indology. Its study requires not only the knowledge of Sanskrit and Pali, but also of Chinese, Tibetan and Japanese.

INTRODUCTION OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE INTO GERMANY

Indian culture and literature were not wholly unknown in the Western world in early days; only their knowledge was rather vague and casual. The first information about Indian matters and conditions was brought to Europe by commercial travellers, and later by missionaries who, to pursue their work, had to learn the Indian languages, especially the idioms of Southern India. The missionaries were naturally most interested in the mission work; their interest in Indian literature and thought was meagre. When they occupied themselves with Indian languages, literature and culture, they did it for the sole sake of bringing the Gospel to the heathen Indians. They are not to blame for it, because they thought it their most noble duty to convert the pagans to the Christian religion. Thus they saw Indian things only from their narrow Christian point of view. To give an instance: in the year 1713 appeared in Madras a small booklet written in Tamil by

the famous missionary Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg. The title of this book runs in English translation : 'On the contemptuous activity of heathenish deceptions'. This pamphlet is one of the first books printed in an Indian alphabet.

The Nāgarī script was treated for the first time in detail by Johannes Christophorus Amadutius in the year 1771. This interesting work appeared in Rome and was entitled : 'Alphabeticum Brammhanicum sev Indostanum Universitatis Kasi'. About the end of the 18th century two Sanskrit grammars were composed by the Austrian missionary Fra Paolino de St. Bartolomeo.

But these books, written by missionaries for practical purposes, did not inspire in Europe the study of Sanskrit from a literary point of view. As the real founders of Indian philology three Englishmen must be considered : Charles Wilkins, William Jones and especially Henry Thomas Colebrooke. These three men were officers in the service of the East Indian Company. All three of them, though not professional philologists, engaged themselves with great energy in the study of Sanskrit and Indian culture. As the first fruits of his Sanskrit studies

Wilkins published in the year 1785 an English translation of the Bhagavadgītā.

As a matter of course a well-founded and comprehensive knowledge of Sanskrit could only be gained in India through constant contact with Indian scholars. Wilkins, Jones and Colebrooke took advantage of this opportunity and showed themselves, in contrast to many others, really interested. Reading the Essays of Colebrooke one is indeed astonished at the knowledge he had acquired in the wide field of both Sanskrit and Indian history and culture.

About Wilkins the young Colebrooke once wrote in a letter of the year 1788 the following: 'That gentleman is Sanskrit-mad, and has more materials and more general knowledge respecting the Hindus than any other foreigner ever acquired since the days of Pythagoras'. And in the year before, Jones had written to Wilkins: 'You are the first European that ever understood Sanskrit, and will possibly be the last'. This prophecy has fortunately not come true; but may be it was not meant too seriously.

These three men transmitted, by their publications and especially by their English translations of the most famous works of Indian lite-

rature the knowledge of Sanskrit to the Western world, and stand therefore at the head of Indian studies in Europe.

From the time when Sanskrit became known in Germany its study has never slackened. Germans became the leaders and pioneers in investigating Sanskrit language and literature and Indian culture. German literature and philosophy of the 19th century also show a strong Indian influence. It was perceived and felt that there exists an innermost relationship between the German and the Indian mind. Though the poetic expression may differ widely, the character and essence of German poetry comes very near to the Indian, especially during the romantic period of the 19th century. It is no chance that Sanskrit philology in Germany begins with Friedrich Schlegel. The brothers Friedrich Schlegel and August Wilhelm Schlegel were the leaders of German Romanticism, and the great and genuine love Friedrich Rückert had for oriental and particularly Indian poetry is based on the fact that he as a German romantic poet felt a real relationship to the Indian mind. But he does not stand alone, he may be considered the representa-

tive of the whole nation. Leopold von Schroeder, a well-known German Indologist, was indeed right in saying: 'The Indians are the nation of romanticists of antiquity, the Germans are the romanticists of modern times'.

The same is true as concerns the field of science and humanistic studies. In Germany there was always the same aim as in India namely, to investigate, to explore and to go to the very bottom of all matters within the range of human understanding.

Friedrich Schlegel and Franz Bopp must be named among the first scholars who understood Sanskrit. Both learned it in Paris, which at that time had became so to speak a centre of Sanskrit studies, when the Englishman Alexander Hamilton on his return from India was forced to stay some years in Paris. Friedrich Schlegel, who was attracted before all by Kālidāsa's drama Śakuntalā (translated into German from the English translation of William Jones), joined Hamilton in Paris during the years 1803 and 1804, to learn Sanskrit from him. The result of Schlegel's study in Paris was his work 'Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Inder' (About the language and wisdom of the Indians),

published in the year 1808. Thus Friedrich Schlegel became the founder of Indian philology in Germany.

Franz Bopp, born in 1791 in Mainz, went to Paris in 1812 and learnt Sanskrit from the Frenchman Chézy together with August Wilhelm Schlegel. August Wilhelm Schlegel, the brother of Friedrich Schlegel, became a very active scholar of Sanskrit. He was the first Sanskrit Professor in Germany, being called to the newly founded University of Bonn in the year 1818.

Franz Bopp, on the other hand, is the founder of Comparative Philology of the Indo-European languages. The first result of his reading the Mahābhārata was his edition of the famous tale of Nala and Damayantī, published together with a Latin translation in 1819. His 'Glossarium Sanscritum', an important complement to the mentioned edition, appeared in 1830.

It must, however, be confessed that Bopp, in contrast to the brothers Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, was much more interested in the Indian language than in Indian literature. Because of the astonishing richness of forms and the abundance of consonants, he believed that the mother language of the Indo-European

tongues had been found. He started with Sanskrit and explained, for instance, the vowel changes in Greek and Latin as the peculiarities of these languages.

We shall not discuss here the language from the linguistic point of view, but we shall try to show how and to what extent Sanskrit literature became known and appreciated in Germany. As it is not possible to go into details, we can mention only a few characteristic features.

In very early times motifs from Indian stories and fables were brought to the Western world by way of the neighbouring countries, such as Persia. But scarcely was anyone conscious of the fact that it was India from where these tales took their origin; for the way and manner of tale and fable-telling had partly changed, being adapted to the circumstances and perceptions of the people of a different character.

In the first place it was the old philosophy of the Upanishads which became known in Europe, but unfortunately in an insufficient way and through a rather turbid source, that is by Anquetil Duperron's Oupnek'hat. This Latin

translation published in 1801-2 was not made from the Indian original text of the Upanishads, but from a Persian translation which was produced in Delhi in the year 1665. Moreover the Latin translator Duperron did not understand Sanskrit. Regarding these facts nobody can expect that the thoughts and the doctrines of the Upanishads were transmitted in a pure form. Nor could they be appreciated in their true value. Notwithstanding, the knowledge gained from that secondary source had a deep influence on the great German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer. Enthusiastically he wrote about Anquetil Duperron's Oupnek'hat in one of his main works 'Parerga and Paralipomena' (II.427): 'It is the most advantageous and elevating reading which (except the original) is possible in the world : it has been the consolation of my life and will be my consolation in the hour of my death.' Many others gained their knowledge of that old Indian philosophy from Schopenhauer, and among these may be named Richard Wagner, the great German composer.

But it has been and still is much more difficult to win a real understanding of the works of Indian poets and to do justice to them

from the Indian point of view. For the sublime beauty of Indian poetry can only be understood from the Indian world itself. It is possible to translate works which deal with history, philosophy, religion and so on and to understand them, but it is wholly impossible to translate Indian poetry into a Western language. To understand a kāvya one must be, as it were, a kavi himself, but a kavi in another sense of the word. Many things are necessary to become a kavi; he needs to understand completely the grammar, the Alaṃkāraśāstra and so on. It may of course be easy to get the knowledge of these requisites and to get the ability to employ them correctly; but they are only the tools so to speak. What on the other hand can never be learned, what must be born together with the man, perhaps as a fruit of his karman, is what is called in Sanskrit the pratibhā, the genius, the exalted intellectual power, the fantasy, the brilliancy of thoughts, shortly the gift, the wonderful gift of Sarasvatī. And this pratibhā is said to be twofold: kārayitrī and bhāvayitrī, as Rājaśekhara has pointed out in his Kāvyamīmāṃsā. The poet himself naturally possesses the pratibhā kārayitrī, that is the creative

fantasy, but the man who understands fully the poet and who becomes as it were of one soul with him, the man who enjoys the work of the poet, this man has the pratibhā bhāvayitrī, the enjoying fantasy, the enjoying genius. In this manner the reader or hearer of a kāvya may be considered as a kavi himself.

This state of complete understanding can never be attained by means of a translation, because both word and sense are united in such a harmonious unity that the one can no more be separated from the other. Every translation destroys this natural unity and what is left are words without charm.

The Chinese biography of the Buddhist monk and translator Kumarajīva (who died in 413 in Chang-an) has preserved for us the following words of this famous writer :

'It is the national custom of the Indians to lay great stress on literary perfection and to them that style seems the best which is fitted to the melodious and rhythmical character of string-music....But if you translate the Indian language into Chinese, it looses its charm. Although you can render the general meaning, you fail to preserve the beauty of expression to a very large

extent. It is just as if one chews rice first and then hands it to another: the second person is not only deprived of the taste, but will, in fact, be caused to spit out the rice.'

Indeed this is very apt.

The thoughts which the great Indian poets put in words lose all their beauty in translation, not to speak of the fact that persons and things are sometimes not described in the manner which the reader in the Western world would think to be the most poetical. Again and again it is underlined that the kavi writes only for the connoisseur. Thus it is clear from the beginning that in a translation of an Indian poetical work the vocal expression must come off badly.

The differences in style between Sanskrit on the one hand and (for instance) German on the other are indeed very great. To mention just one peculiarity, the Sanskrit language is not very fond of subordinate sentences, the compounds being used instead. Such compounds which rule the poetical language in a very remarkable degree and give it a peculiar charm, can hardly be imitated in German, and if they are, they sound artificial. But a translation will be impossible, if—and that happens very often—a

Sanskrit word has to be understood in two different ways, or if a compound receives a different meaning by another interpretation, when, to speak with the Indian authorities of poetics, a comparison (an upamā or a rūpaka) is animated by a śleṣa. Such things which are possible only in Sanskrit can not but be expressed by a twofold translation of the whole sentence. It is easy to imagine that by way of such an analytic translation the charming set up of the Sanskrit vocal expression will be totally disturbed. The translation can only be made in a completely free form, which is no more Indian. What remains is only the contents, which has lost the greater part of its significance and beauty, because word and sense have been separated, the one from the other.

He who does not know Indian things or does not trouble himself with trying to understand the Indian world of thoughts and ideals will be led to judge Indian poetry from his own and narrow point of view, which he thinks right, and therefore will not be able to appreciate the Indian poetical genius.

The differences are naturally very great. Thus the things and phenomena of nature are,

in many cases, of varying meaning and importance for the East and for the West. Comparisons are an essential part of all poetry. But the standard of comparison, the upamāna, as it is called in Sanskrit, has in many cases a different meaning or significance. I just want to mention the extremely numerous comparisons in which the upamāna is the moon. After the dull heat of the day the night with the moon as its sign brings refreshing coolness and sot he moon with its soft glimmer is the object of comparison to all that is lovely and delightful. Thus it is very natural that the Indian poets speak again and again of a face-moon, when they intend to describe the charming and lovely face of a maiden. But in our language comparison of the face with the moon is not accompanied by the same imagination as in India. German poets glorify the moon as the messenger of peace, calmness and meditation. As an example of a poetical description of the moon which reminds us a little of Indian poetry, though there is no mention of a moon-face, I want to quote to you a little poem of Friedrich Rückert who had good knowledge of Indian literature. Though the title of the poem 'An den Mond' refers to the moon, the

whole is to be understood in a symbolic manner. From the Indian point of view we may call the poem an aprastutapraśaṃsā, that is a figure of speech which, by describing what is not the subject matter, conveys a reference to the subject matter.

Here the moon is praised, but that is only a pretext to glorify the beloved maiden One may pay attention to the fact that neither the word 'moon' nor the word 'beloved maiden' is used in any of the verses. The word 'moon' occurs only in the title.

I will first read the poem in German to show its melody and rhythm, and then the English translation in simple prose. I should prefer to present to you a Sanskrit translation in verses too, but firstly I am no poet, and secondly I should be blamed by the Ālaṃkārikas, because the Sanskrit poem would contain the doṣa of liṅgabheda, as 'moon' (*candra*) and 'beloved maiden' (*kāntā*) are of different genders.

I shall read now the first stanza:

Du bist die Ruh,	Thou art repose
Der Friede mild,	and mild peace,
Die Sehnsucht du,	thou art longing
Und was sie stillt.	and what satisfies it.

Ich weihe dir	I devote to thee
Voll Lust und Schmerz	my eyes and heart
Zur Wohnung hier	full of joy and pain
Mein Aug und Herz	to dwell therein.

The poet means: My eye will always look to thy beauty, and with my heart I shall treasure thy excellent qualities of mind and soul.

Kehr ein bei mir	Come to me and repose
Und schliesse du	and behind thee
Still hinter dir	softly close
Die Pforten zu;	the door !
Treib andern Schmerz	Expel all other pain
Aus dieser Brust,	out of this breast,
Voll sei dies Herz	this heart may be filled
Von deiner Lust !	of thy delight !
Dies Augenzelt,	This eye of mine,
Von deinem Glanz	enlighted only
Allein erhellt,	by thy lustre,
O füll es ganz!	O, fill it completely !

I think these to be the most beautiful verses poet Rückert ever wrote.

As said before the stanzas contain, if examined with the critical eyes of the Indian masters of the poetic art, the doṣa of liṅgabheda. But in German poetry this is not a doṣa.

This leads me to another matter which is of great importance for the language itself. Our

occidental poets often treat linguistic expressions very freely which is forbidden in simple prose. For the Indian poets, on the contrary, the grammatical correctness of the language is inviolable. The particular character of Sanskrit, which has its own source of existence and history, causes the fact, that grammar itself, in a certain way, belongs to poetry. Thus Kālidāsa's works show a lot of comparisons which refer to grammar. In the Raghuvaṃśa, for instance, we find (XI 56) the following stanza:

ता नराधिपसुता नृपात्मजैस्ते च ताभिरगमन्कृतार्थताम् ।
सोऽभवद्वरवधूसमागमः प्रत्ययप्रकृतियोगसंनिभः ॥

The connection of theory with poetry, unfamiliar to us, is the reason why even the reading of a commentary is attractive and possesses a certain charm, but of course only when the commentator himself is a genius. Fortunately the famous Indian poets Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha have found their great commentator in Mallinātha; the commentary belongs now to the poet's work and can no more be separated from it. The union of both resembles as it were an anyonya-alaṃkāra: the one is embellished by the other.

That I chose a poem by Friedrich Rückert,

has a particular reason. Among the German poets who really understood Indian poetry and judged it in the right way it is just Friedrich Rückert whom we have to mention. He belongs to those famous German poets who will never be forgotten. He lived from 1788-1866 and was for a long time professor of Oriental languages. But, being more a poet and a scholar, he was not very fond of teaching.

To form a real opinion of Rückert's work one has to consider that at his time, which is the first part of the 19th century, there existed very few auxiliary works for studying Indian grammar and even fewer works of Indian literature. Sometimes there was only one copy, which wandered from hand to hand. For his studies Rückert used the grammar of Charles Wilkins, who has been mentioned before.

Though Rückert calls himself a pupil of Bopp he acquired his surprising knowledge of Sanskrit mostly by his own studies. He had a genuine love and also the corresponding talents for the languages of the East and before all for Sanskrit. He knew also Persian and Arabic; but these were not his only studies. We find him occupied with Albanian, Coptic, Tartarian and

Berberian idioms also. Among the tongues of Southern and Further India he was interested in Canarese and Malay, but most of all in Tamil. Thus he started in 1839 a Tamil glossary, which would be a rather bulky volume. He continued it to the year 1862 on slips. His Semitic-Indo-European studies would also fill a big volume.

Rückert's love for Indian poetry was immense, and to be able to understand it thoroughly he undertook linguistic studies. His still existing notes and sketches, which I found among his papers preserved in the former Prussian State Library at Berlin, show, how eagerly he endeavoured to acquire a complete understanding of the poet's language.

Rückert himself was a poet, and through his theoretical researches he was easily able to get a feeling for things Indian and to enjoy Indian poetry from the aesthetic point of view. He possessed both, the pratibhā kārayitrī the creating fantasy, and the pratibhā bhāvayitrī, the enjoying fantasy.

Best known is his poetical translation of the tale of Nala and Damayantī, which because of its charming contents has always met with a special favour in Germany up to these days. It

has become a tradition since the days of Bopp to start the study of Sanskrit with Nalopākhyāna.* The translation of this episode of the Mahābhārata offered no difficulty to a scholar like Rückert. But he also chose rather difficult works for his studies and for translation. Thus for instance he translated Bhāravi's Kirātārjunīya completely into German prose, by constantly using and excerpting the commentary of Mallinātha. I found the whole manuscript of Rükkert's prose translation among his papers. He certainly had the ambition to put the whole work into German verses. As a matter of fact he fulfilled this ambition for some parts and published them in a German journal.

Especially attractive to Rückert was the Amaruśataka. It may be mentioned that he had some trouble to get a copy of the Sanskrit text. Again and again he engaged himself with this work. He re-studied it from beginning to end, and finally he was happy to have won a better understanding of it. In fact he translated the whole work into German poetry. In the year 1831, however, he published only 38 stanzas and the rest remained unknown to the public until I found among his unedited papers the manu-

script of the complete work and published it about 25 years ago.

There is another Indian poem of quite a different nature which attracted Rückert, the Gīta-govinda by Jayadeva. It attracted him because of its contents, but even more on account of its wonderful rhythm and melody. The greatest part of the work he published in the German journal: 'Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes'.

Rückert's metrical translations of Sanskrit poetry follow rather closely the form of expression of the Indian originals. But as I mentioned before it is not possible, from the literary point of view, to faithfully convey the linguistic expressions and e.g. to imitate in a literal manner the Indian compounds. Therefore Rückert's translations are not known to as many people as it would be desirable. The thoughts and perceptions of India are rather strange and unfamiliar to those who know only their own.

Germany's greatest poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, took a vivid interest in Indian poetry. But only that kind of Indian poetry was to his taste that expressed human feelings and sentiments in a simple and natural way.

Thus the tale of Nala and Damayantī, the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa and above all Śakuntalā made the deepest impression on him. As to the Meghadūta Goethe said that this poem 'delineates real human stuff'. He became acquainted with the drama Śakuntalā through a German translation (that of G. Forster) from the English version of William Jones. Having read the second-hand translation Goethe wrote in the same year the following enthusiastic verses:

> Would'st thou the young year's blossoms and the fruits of its decline
> And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted, fed,
> Would'st thou the Heaven and Earth itself in one sole name combine?
> I name thee, Sakontala! and all at once is said.

Even the form of the drama did not fail to influence the German poet. The main work of Goethe, the tragedy of Faust, begins with a prologue in which the director, the playwright and the jester make their appearance. They converse with each other upon the play in question. There is no doubt that here Goethe has imitated the Indian drama Śakuntalā, which starts with a similar prologue. The jester in the prologue to 'Faust' reminds one of the Vidūṣaka in the

Indian drama. It is true that older German pieces have also their jesters; but their character is quite different from that of the jester in Goethe's 'Faust', where he resembles more the Vidūṣaka of the Indian drama.

In his notes to the 'West östlichen Divan' Goethe discusses at great length the art of rendering Oriental poetry. He says there are three kinds of translations ; the first is translating in simple prose. The second kind Goethe calls the 'paraphrastic' one. Here foreign poetry is treated freely and is adapted to our own occidental taste. The third kind of translation, says Goethe, is accomodated to the original; and both, the form as well as the ideas come as close as possible to the original. Goethe believes this kind the highest and best, but the taste of the crowd has to be educated for this kind, because the translator does not pay any heed to the ways of thinking of his own nation. In connection with this Goethe discusses the translations of the Śakuntalā and the Meghadūta. Goethe is talking here about the metrical English translation of the Meghadūta which was published by H. H. Wilson in 1813. This translation Goethe declares to be one of the second type, paraphrastic

and supplementary, and by the five feet jambus it sounds well to the ear. Goethe himself preferred the simple kind of translation. Johann Gottfried Ludwig Kosegarten, Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages in Greifswald in Germany, translated for him some verses of the Meghadūta literally. Goethe claims that this translation gave him a much better idea of the original poem.

Summing up we may say that of all German poets it was Friedrich Rückert who understood best the character of Indian peotry. This is due to the fact that he possessed a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit and did not have any trouble in approaching the problems of Indian thought and culture and in understanding in the right way and from the Indian point of view the original works of Sanskrit poetry.

NIRVĀNA AND BRAHMAN-ĀTMAN

The term Nirvāṇa as the expression for the highest and last aim of Buddhist life is well-known in the Western world and is considered as having some kind of mystic charm which can not be explained by words. The inability to find words to give a clear idea of what is meant by Nirvāṇa may indeed be thought in some way as a definition. But for the Western mind there are some principal difficulties which hinder the real understanding of it. For the highest aim of the various religious systems and especially of Christianity is, undoubtedly, of a positive character. The last goal of all religious effort is considered as an eternal happiness, as an everlasting bliss. This positive bliss may consist in the eternal association and union with God, in the 'contemplation of the face of God', as a higher life in which all sorrow and grief are completely extinguished, although it may be difficult to perceive and to explain exactly the true character of this everlasting bliss. But in-

spite of this impossibility to have a clear conception of this happy state which will follow, when the human being has given up the body on earth, this state is never thought of as something other than a real happiness in its purest character.

But Nirvāna can not be understood in this positive sense which is common in Christianity and in other religions. How, then, may Buddhism be called a religion in the European sense of the word?

Another point must be considered as being of great importance. As according to the general opinion in the West, there can be no religion without the idea of an everlasting bliss after death in a better and more beautiful world, the term 'religion' can hardly be applied to a system in which the idea of 'God' as the highest personality does not form the basis or is even expressly denied.

Now we find in Buddhism neither the clear idea of an everlasting bliss in a positive sense, nor the idea of the supreme personality called 'God'. But in spite of this nobody will deny that Buddhism is a religion and nobody holds it to be a mere philosophy.

Buddhism then appears to be, in its ideal form, a religion both without a clear conception of a personality called 'God' and a clear idea of an eternal happiness in the positive sense of the word. Regarding these two points the difficulty exists for us only, and not for the Indian world.

One is often inclined in the world outside India to say that Buddhism has been created as a totally new system or creed which has but little to do with the older religious doctrines taught in India. This error is due to the fact that Buddhism is much better known, as it has become a religion and has been promulgated and propagated from the earliest times and on account of that has spread out widely beyond the Indian frontiers; whilst on the other hand the doctrine of Brahman-Ātman as laid down in the Upanishads has been considered to be a privilege so to speak of a certain class of learned men who were initiated to a mystery which they were not willing to share with others

But examining critically the theoretical foundations of Brahmanism on the one side and of Buddhism on the other, we must concede that the foundations of the Buddhist doctrine are not principally new. Not even the word Nirvāna

as a term for 'deliverance' is especially Buddhist. We find it not only in profane poetry, but also (which is of greater importance) in the Bhagavadgītā, where in a very remarkable way the term Nirvāna is used in connection with Brahman. According to the context the word shows the same meaning as śānti which also occurs in Buddhist texts as a synonym of Nirvāna. We read in the Bhagavadgīta V. 24-26 :

'Who finds his happiness within, his joy within,
And likewise his light only within,
That disciplined man to Brahma-nirvāṇa
Goes, having become Brahman.
Brahma-nirvāna is won
By the seers whose sins are destroyed,
Whose doubts are cleft, whose souls are controlled,
Who delight in the welfare of all beings.
To those who have put off desire and wrath,
Religious men whose minds are controlled,
Close at hand Brahma-nirvāna
Comes, to knowers of the self." (Prof. Edgerton)

We may however bear in mind that in these important stanzas a distinction is made between Nirvana and Brahman : The Nirvāna or śānti, consists in that the Yogin enters Brahman or becomes Brahman himself. In one of the main works of Mahāyāna Buddhism, in the well known

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka (II. 124), Lord Buddha is represented as saying: 'Since that time (that is after the Sermon of Benares) the wheel of my dharma has started and the name of Nirvāna has come into the world.' But it is very doubtful, whether Buddha himself has laid such a great stress on the term Nirvāna. It is more probable that the historical Buddha took the term from common usage.

Before entering a short discussion about the significance of Nirvāna in the Buddhist doctrine, we may consider the foundations of its conception.

Lastly, the idea of Nirvāna is based upon, and cannot be imagined without, another thesis which is not a doctrine invented by the Buddhists: the doctrine of karman and of the reward of karman in a following existence. The ripening of karman leads time and again to new existences, beginning with birth and ending with death. The theory of reincarnation after death is the typical Indian conception of life and was not doubted even by the materialists. The origin of this revolutionising doctrine is however very obscure. It occurs for the first time in the older Upanishads; but we cannot find out the

actual circumstances which gave birth to this theory that should become of so great a consequence in India as well as in Tibet and countries of Central and Eastern Asia, where Buddhism entered in later times. In the Vedic hymns we do not yet find any trace of the doctrine of karman and rebirth as being produced by its effect. In the older Upanishads also the theory of rebirth had not yet been generally accepted. Even one of the chief teachers of the Upanishads, the great sage Yajñavalkya, refused and refuted the theory categorically, using the simile of the tree which cannot grow again once it has been uprooted. Yajñavalkya rejects the argument of the followers of the rebirth doctrine who maintain that the human being is reborn by means of the semen. He objects that the semen comes only from a living creature; what has died, he says, can never return.

This discussion of Yajñavalkya in presence of the king of Videha shows on the other hand that the doctrine of rebirth had developed already into a wide-spread creed.

And in this connection it may be borne in mind that the Brahmans had another theory, which we may also call in some way 'reincarna·

tion' and which has its firm root in the Veda. The lifê of a Brahman was as it were continued in his son. The possession of a son who would continue the family was therefore considered as the greatest bliss, much more desirable than riches and wealth. The request for descendants is again and again set forth in the hymns of the Rigveda.

The belief in rebirth, then, had become generally accepted. It may be considered indeed a highly important perception: all troubles of life have their origin in the deeds of one of the former existences. For the casualities of life had thus been found a quite natural and rationalistic explanation.

Reincarnation had been accepted as a fact and needed no further proof.

At the same time discussion centered around the way in which rebirth was effected. These discussions, however, were of a theoretical character and may have been accepted or rejected There are several passages in the older Upanishads in which the philosophers tried to explain the mysterious and enigmatical process of reincarnation. We may consider the well-known theory laid down in the Chandogya-Upanishad

(5.10.1-10). It is said:

Those who in this world know that (i.e. the doctrine of Brahman) and have undergone penance in the forests enter after death the flame of the funeral pile, from here the day, from here the crescent half of the month, then the six months, during which the sun wanders to North, then the year, the sun, the moon and then the lightning. This resting in the lightning is considered as the critical point. In the lightning there is a man who however does not show the appearance of a man, we may say: a 'superman'. He accompanies them to Brahman. This category of beings do no more return to earth.

Now the Upanishad describes the way the second class of men go :

The other beings who perform good works here on earth enter after death the smoke of the funeral pile, from the smoke the night, from here the diminishing half of the month, then the six months during which the sun wanders to South. These beings, however, do not reach the year, but enter the realm of the Fathers, from here they enter the sky and then the moon. After having dwelt in the moon (which is considered as the food of the gods) as long as there is a rest of their good

works, they return the same way they came, they enter the sky and from here the wind. After having become wind they become smoke, haze, or raining cloud. Becoming rain they fall to earth. Here on earth they come up as rice, barley, sesame etc. The coming out from here, however, is difficult. For only if a man just eats such food and is pouring it out as sperm, then that will be reincarnated, being the result of the sperm. Those beings on the one hand who have lived on earth a good and virtuous life enter the womb of a Brāhmana, a Kshatriya, or a Vaiśya according to their deeds; but those on the other hand who have lived wrongly on earth enter a wrong womb, that of a dog, of a pig, or of a Cāndāla.

There is also a passage in the Kaushītakī-Upanishad (1.1.7) which discusses the same matter. The answer, however, does not differ principally from the theory given in the Chāndogya-Upanishad. We may pay special attention to the role the moon plays in this context. The moon has always been considered as the symbol or rather as the giver of peace and calmness. His mild light bestows coolness and recreation after the day's heat and trouble to all

beings. He is thought to be the door to heaven. He is the first abode of the prāṇas which leave the dying man. He becomes more and more full by the prāṇas in the first half of the month. He puts some questions to the souls. Whosoever cannot answer them falls down again as rain and has to suffer rebirth on earth. But he who can answer enters the world of Prajāpati, the Creator, and then enters Brahman and becomes Brahman.

In this old theory, which has been thought over very carefully, the fact of rebirth is clearly expressed. It is further pointed out that a good karman will lead to a good rebirth on earth and a bad karman to a bad rebirth. Only that man who knows the mystery of Brahman-Ātman and lives according to the prescripts in the forest, performing penance etc., will not be born again, but will enter Brahman, and become Brahman.

It is highly remarkable that the philosophers of the Upanishads did not content themselves with stating the mere fact of rebirth as the result of karman, but tried also to present an answer to the question in which way this rebirth or reincarnation on the one hand and this entering Brahman on the other is realized. With respect

to those old times, when very little was known about the cosmic conception of the Universe, when sun, moon and stars were generally considered as abodes of beings in an ethereal condition of life, the explanations and theories found in the Upanishads must indeed be appreciated as ingenious. As all human understanding is imperfect, because Nature is not willing to unveil her mystery, a satisfactory explanation of the important problem of rebirth has never been given nor can it be given.

Older Buddhism did not discuss the question, as Buddha himself denied the profit of any metaphysical discussion, which in his opinion is but a hindrance on the road to salvation. Notwithstanding, later Buddhism has treated the matter in question very exhaustively. In trying to solve the problem of rebirth as the necessary issue of karman the philosophers of Mahāyāna Buddhism found a way quite different from that of the Upanishads. They tried to solve the problem from the psychological point of view.

These discussions are a little complicated and naturally have the value of an ingenious theory only. Although the Buddhists as well as the Brahmanical philosophers recognize the fact

of transmigration, the former deny the existence of the personal ātman, which shows us the tremendous difference between Buddhist and Brahmanical philosophy. The Buddhist thesis leads however to a difficulty, as there seems to be a rebirth without a personality to be reborn. What is called personality or I (ātman) by the Brahmans is in the opinion of the Buddhists only an aggregate or combination of groups called *skandhas* which are changing every moment.

Though all dharmas, that is all things, attributes, actions, etc. of the phenomenal world are transitory, there exists, according to the famous Buddhist school of the Vijñānavādins, a base to which is ascribed a relative reality. This base is called *ālaya-vijñāna*, the receptacle of consciousness, if the term be so translated. In this receptacle the seeds of all dharmas are stored up. On account of the ripeness of the deeds the seeds are unfolded and become the causes of a new rise of the dharmas. Between the ālaya-vijñāna and the seeds exists a peculiar connection so that both the ālaya-vijñāna and the bījas are one the cause for the other, that is at the same time the ālaya-vijñāna becomes the cause

of the rise of the dharmas, and the dharmas become the cause of the existence of the ālaya-vijñāna, in the same way as for instance the combustion of the wick is the cause for the existence of the flame and the existence of the flame is the cause for the combustion of the wick. Though the bījas (the seeds) in the ālaya-vijñāna never perish, they are not constant, but rather an uninterrupted series of dharmas. We may compare this with the flame of a light: the flame is renewing itself every moment; although we have the impression of a constant and continual existence of the flame, it is obvious that the flame in this moment is not the same as in the moment before. If there are no more bījas, then the ālaya-vijñāna also can arise no more. In this case it will not come to a new existence: the state of Nirvāṇa is attained. That corresponds to the first case of the Upanishad theory, namely: the human being does not come back to earth again but enters Brahman and becomes Brahman. The essential difference, however, consists in the fact, that in conformity with the Brahmanical dogma the ātman, the personality, the I, is released, becoming identical with Brahman-Ātman, the All-soul, while according

to Buddhism there is no personality at all, but a series of skandhas which change every moment. That this series of skandhas, erroneously considered to be the personality, may not arise again, that is the effect of salvation.

The ālaya-vijñāna, which is of a relative reality, vanishes only under the supposition that there are no more dharmas or, what in this connection is the same, no more karmans. This is the state of the Arhat, the Saint. In the case of still existing dharmas, however, the process is another one. Then the ālaya-vijñāna continues to exist, being developed again by the dharmas.

The vijñāna, the consciousness, of the ālaya-vijñāna is as such neutral and shows no changes, but it exists. By the ripening of the karman, however, this vijñāna is undergoing changes. It becomes, so to speak, perfumed or dyed by the dharmas in many ways according to the deeds. One may also say, the vijñāna of the ālaya-vijñāna becomes infected or impregnated. It resembles a garment, which shows no colour, before it is dipped into a vessel containing a dye. But when it is dipped into a receptacle filled with dye, then indeed it receives various tinges according to the kind of dye employed. In qulte

the same manner the vijñāna of the ālaya-vijñāna, originally without changes, shows in the receptacle of the dye-liquids, namely the ripened deeds, countless different dharmas.

As a result of this infection, which is called vāsanā, arise by means of the mediation of manas. thinking, the six special forms of consciousness, namely eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and thinking. This last consciousness, thinking, is also called manas; and though it is designated by the same word, it is not the same as the just-mentioned manas which intermediates between the infected ālaya-vijñāna and the several forms of consciousness.

In this way cause is given to new existences, to good and to bad ones, in conformity with the deeds by which the ālaya-vijñāna is infected.

For the doctrine of the Upanishads as well as for the doctrine of Buddhism karman is as it were the machine by which rebirth is effected. Indeed karmayantra (kammayanta) is a common expression in Buddhist-Sanskrit and Pali texts. But what is reborn is according to Buddhist teaching not the personality as a real unity (which does not exist), but a series of skandhas or elements, a series which is changing every

moment like the light of a candle.

In addition to the doctrine of karman there is yet another point which is common to Brahmanism and Buddhism. While in Christian religion for instance the supposition for being released is faith, in Brahmanism and in Buddhism it is the 'knowledge', the vidyā. In the Upanishads this is stressed very emphatically. It is not only stated that he who knows that, namely the high doctrine of Brahman-Ātman, enters Brahman, but it is also repeated frequently that he who knows that becomes that what he is knowing. Or negatively expressed, the 'not-knowing' is the cause why the being cannot be released, but has to undergo new troubles in new existences.

In the same way in Buddhism the 'knowing' is the essential point; it is, however, stressed much more that the not-knowing, the avidyā, is the source of all trouble and misery, the cause of being reborn. Only he who gives up the 'not-knowing' can be released from sorrow, grief and distress. And while in Brahmanism the knowing consists in the fact that the human being is conscious that in reality he is not different from Brahman-Ātman, the vidyā in Buddhism

is specified as the knowing of the four Noble Truths, which are considered the basis of the Buddhist religion, namely, the truth of suffering, of the origin of suffering, of the removal of suffering and of the way which leads to the removal of suffering. The avidyā therefore is the first link in the twelve-linked formula of causality, which ends with age, illness and death and the whole mass of misery.

The chief problem in Buddhism, however, may be stated in two questions: Are we able to get a plain and satisfactory conception of the term Nirvāna, and does Nirvāna, as regards its real nature, resemble the Ātman-Brahman of the Upanishads? With respect to the first question: what is Nirvāna? We have to distinguish between the pure philosophical and metaphysical point of view and the description and praise of Nirvāna in the poetic literature of the Buddhists.

According to the great philosophers of Mahayāna we must accept without further questioning the simple fact that Nirvāna cannot be defined, and that the fact that it cannot be defined is just the very characteristic mark of Nirvāna. It lies beyond all existence and non-existence, it lies beyond all possible combinations of existence

and non-existence. All what may be said is only of a negative character in the sense that Nirvāṇa is the end of the troubles of rebirth i.e. of saṃsāra. This conception may be expressed in a more philosophic manner. So says Nāgārjuna, the great master of Mahāyāna : 'Nirvāṇa is called that in which there does no more exist the relation between cause and effect'. A positive answer can never be found, because all what we may say does not transgress the sphere of existence or non-existence. And this was surely the opinion of Buddha himself, who therefore declined to enter into any speculation on the real nature of Nirvāṇa. Nirvāṇa remains a mystery.

Looking back to Brahman-Ātman we meet with quite similar explanations. The words of the Upanishads leave no doubt about the impossibility of finding a definition or a positive explanation of what is called Brahman-Ātman. We read the words : 'The Ātman cannot be seized (*agṛhya*), the words return from him together with the thought without grasping him'. This Ātman cannot be seized, neither by intuition nor by much learning'. The Kena-Upanishad says : 'If you think you know him rightly, then you know in fact very little about him. To whom

he remains unknown, that man knows him, and who understands him, this man does not know him'. And: 'The eye does not go there, the voice does not go there, nor thinking. We do not know, we do not understand in which manner he should be taught'. The same fact is expressed by the *coincidentia oppositorum*: 'He is greater than the greatest and finer than the finest'. 'This one is without motion and yet faster than thinking. The gods do not overtake him. He outruns those who run, when he is standing still.' All these words stress the simple fact that Brahman-Ātman cannot be defined. Shortly, whatever may be said or thought about Brahman-Ātman, there exists one answer only: 'No, No !' (*neti neti*).

The description of Nirvāṇa is of the same kind and couched in similar words. Instead of calling your attention to some passages from the Pali and Sanskrit-Buddhist texts, I wish to point out to a little-known utterance of a Chinese Buddhist monk of the 5th century A.C. It is Sêng Chao, perhaps the most talented disciple of the famous Kumārajīva. In a long letter written by Sêng Chao we read the following: 'The Nirvāṇa is the mysterious abode with res-

pect to which every designation fails. It is alone and empty and cannot be seized by shape or words. It is fine and marvellous and can never be understood by thinking. Outside the common it arises mysteriously and penetrates the wide emptiness to enter there for ever. Following it you cannot reach its trace; encountering it you cannot see its head. The six abodes of rebirth do not contain its being; time cannot change its nature. The eyes do not see its form; the ears do not hear its sound. It is dark and profound. Who does see it, who does recognize it? It is penetrating all that is existing and leads yet alone away from both existence and non-existence'.

Comparing what is taught about the real nature of Brahman-Ātman as well as about Nirvāna from the philosophical point of view, and comparing the negative method in describing both, we may easily become inclined to call Brahman-Ātman and Nirvāna the 'Absolute'. The complete absence of any attribute may justify this expression, which however is a mere name and does not present a new explanation. This common designation for both terms would support the opinion that both Brahman-Ātman and

Nirvāṇa are really not different from each other, but imply the same idea under different names, and that the Buddhists after all could not find out a completely new conception with respect to the highest aim. But I think it is not so. Although the impossibility of giving a definition of Brahman-Ātman on the one hand and of Nirvāṇa on the other is indeed the characteristic mark of both, matters show quite another air, if we ask for the personality who enjoys Brahman-Ātman and who enjoys Nirvāṇa. In this connection the term ātman is of a decisive importance. According to the teachings of the Upanishads there exists in fact this ātman as the all-pervading, though not definable One-Soul (if we are permitted to use this expression in want of a better one), and we may in fact speak of an enjoyer (*bhoktṛ*). But for the Buddhist the question for the personality (ātman), who enjoys Nirvāna, does not exist at all. The tragic and fatal error of the human being in this phenomenal world is just the very supposition of a personality. And if there is no personality, how could one speak of an enjoyer? The aspect of Nirvāṇa is then wholly different from that of Brahman-Ātman on account of the complete absence of the enjoyer.

Examining this highly important problem we may pay attention to the heretical view of the Buddhist monk Yamaka, related in the Pali Canon. 'At that time (so it is reported) there arose in the mind of the monk Yamaka the fatal view: I understand the doctrine preached by the Buddha in this way, that after the dissolution of the body a monk whose passions have been totally extinguished perishes, vanishes and does no more exist after death' This statement is categorically refuted, but not in a way we may expect, not with regard to the predicate of the sentence (perishes, vanishes and does no more exist), but with regard to the subject 'monk'. The personality of the monk does not exist at all, the heap of skandhas being erroneously taken for the personality. If then the personality does not exist, it is absolutely absurd to say anything about a subject which does not exist.

We now see that the difference between Brahman-Ātman and Nirvāṇa is rather great. The human being, who has perceived that he is not an individual personality, enters the great one, the Brahman-Ātman and becomes Brahman-Ātman. This is a view which is quite intelligible. But there is, strictly speaking, nobody who

enters Nirvāṇa because Nirvāṇa is just enlightenment which consists in realising that there exists absolutely no personality, no ātman.

On account of the existence of an absolute personality of Brahman-Ātman this state can be described as ānanda, as joy, which surpasses all imaginable joy and happiness and for the description of which neither words nor similes can be found. The enjoyer of this absolute joy is Brahman-Ātman, the supreme All-Soul, with whose entity the individual soul is identical. But how can Nirvāṇa be really spoken of as the abode or the state of joy and bliss, if there is no personality at all who may be the enjoyer of that joy?

From what has been said before it will be evident that the last aim of Buddhism, which is called Nirvāṇa, and which means the end of all trouble, that is the end of the circle from death to rebirth and from rebirth to death, can hardly be understood in its whole significance by the common man and even by the Buddhist monk of average intellect. Indeed the common monk will almost never attain the state of the Arhat, the Saint, who knows, that this is his last existence.

The one great hindrance on the way to

Nirvāna lies in human nature and consists in the fact that for the human being it is hard to resign to not being born again and to resign to life in spite of its trouble and sorrow. To endure the thought that one will not be born again is the most important tenor of the pāramitā of kṣanti, of patience. The very ability to bear the thought of not being reborn is just the premise for becoming an Arhat who knows that this is his last existence. He indeed is released.

A human being can hardly attain this state by his own effort and without help. Therefore this help is bestowed by Buddha or the Buddhas; for according to the teaching of Mahāyāna there are innumerable Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; they have no other aim but to help the beings in the worlds of saṃsāra, to find their way out of grief and misery. And with this we come back to the question: may we call Buddhism a religion? It is indeed a religion on account of the fact that the Buddhas represent to a certain degree gods who by their favour, their mercy never grow weary of aiding the beings to tread the path to Nirvāna. For doing so the Buddhas make sacrifices. Although they might enter Nirvāna, they do not enter it, because in this supreme

state they would no more be able to do anything for beings who are still suffering in saṃsāra. They undergo on the contrary and by their own will all sorts of existences and give all, even their own body, for other people who are not yet released.

And more: because the human beings in general are not able to understand wholly the significance of the cessation of existence and Nirvāna, they may reach complete salvation by degrees. Buddhism is not pessimism. After a meritorious life beings may be reborn in a better world, in the realms of the gods to enjoy all sorts of pleasures. As a matter of fact the greater part of monks and nuns follow the law of Buddhism in order to be reborn among the gods in heaven. This happy and blissful existence, however, will find an end, though perhaps after numberless kalpas only.

In order to reach the last goal more easily it will be better to be reborn once more in the Western Paradise of Amitābha Buddha. The doctrine of this land of bliss, which is called Sukhāvatī, was probably established about the beginning of the Christian era, but was developed into a veritable religion, as it were, espe-

cially in Japan. The paradise Sukhāvatī corresponds in some way to the 'kingdom of heaven' of the Christian religion. The happiness in Sukhāvatī consists essentially in the union with the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. The difference from the Christian doctrine, however, lies in the fact that life in Sukhāvatī is not everlasting. It is so to speak only a passage or an episode. Anyone reborn in this Pure Land, however, will understand that real salvation can only be found in complete cessation of all existence. From Sukhāvatī there is no falling back into another existence. From here the human being will attain the last and highest aim, Nirvāṇa.

JAPANESE IN EAST-ASIAN KULTURKREIS

It might seem at first sight that the present theme being concerned with Japanese problems has little to do with Indology. But actually this is not so. Buddhism, the religion dominating in Japan and exerting deep and decisive influence upon its public as well as private life, is an emanation of Indian culture. Scholars should not discontinue to focus their attention on the history, philosophy and general phenomena of Buddhism just because it has ceased to play the role of a religion in India.

For centuries, Brahman and Buddhist philosophers have been fighting their duels of logic and this fact alone should convince us of the necessity to study Buddhism carefully.

In former times, scholars writing books concerning Buddhist problems, confined themselves in most cases to Pali sources only. Pali-Buddhism is, however, only one form or system of Buddhism, as it is prevalent in the South. These sources therefore are not sufficient for a

study of Northern Buddhism; for the standard books of the Buddhist philosophers were written in Sanskrit and enjoy authority to this day, especially in Japan. Unfortunately, the Sanskrit originals have been lost in most cases and are known only in their Tibetan and Chinese translations. All of these texts have been studied carefully and commented upon in Northern India as well as in Tibet, China and Japan. In modern times, it was chiefly left to the Japanese to interpret and to expound Buddhist philosophy on a scholarly basis, with an admirable amount of sagacity.

Consequently, it will not be superfluous to have a close look on the Japanese language and its position within the circle of Far-Eastern culture.

We do not know anything concerning the relations between Japan and the Far-Eastern continent prior to the first century A.C. There might have been some cultural connections, but it was not until the fifth century A.C. that the Japanese made a decisive cultural progress.

The Chinese had a culture of venerable antiquity. Confucius, born in 551 B.C., had already spoken of 'the good old times' and was

never tired to praise the prosperous reigns of the ancient 'model emperors' as an example for the people of his own generation. A long time before the beginning of the Christian era, the Chinese had already a carefully recorded history and an uninterrupted historical tradition, which is extremely valuable, as otherwise we would not know anything about the events in question.

Consequently, all nations appearing on the stage of Far-Eastern history were practically forced to obtain their culture from China and at least to familiarize themselves with the Chinese mode of thinking. The future of these nations depended naturally on their ability to absorb Chinese culture as well as their power to impress the seal of their own national character upon the imported civilisation.

At first the Japanese had no direct contact with the Chinese. Due to their geographical position and being a nation living on islands, they established connections with Korea, and this peninsula was, at least during the most important periods of history, the connecting link between Japan and China. Korea was a prosperous country long before Japan, and in the beginning maintained mostly inimical relations with the

latter. At the time of the birth of Christ, Chinese culture and language had already been introduced into Korea and the Koreans had without hesitation accepted them. All future development of Korea was then deeply influenced by the introduction of Buddhism, which found its way into it via Northern India, Central Asia and China, in 370 A.C.

After a time, Buddhism was transplanted to Japan in 552 A.C. under the reign of emperor Kimmei, from Korea, or rather the important Korean state Pekche.

There was no room for conflict between Shintoism and Buddhism as both were of a completely different character and had nothing in common. The old book on Japanese history, Nihongi, remarks about the emperor Yomei, reigning in 585: 'The Emperor believed in the doctrine of Buddha and worshipped the 'Way of the Gods (shin-tō)'. When the Japanese state began to foster Buddhism, the country experienced a tremendous cultural progress. Many Chinese words, and with them the Chinese script, found their way to Japan. The Japanese, who did not have a script of their own, quickly accepted it. In fact they went too far in their

eagerness to learn. Anything Chinese was considered perfect, and to use Chinese expressions was taken as a sign of education, which one strove to show especially in literary compositions. The old and genuine thesaurus of Japanese words was neglected and often half-forgotten. Japanese words were all too often replaced by Chinese expressions, even in cases where there was absolutely no good reason except that the foreign literary style was thought to be more elegant than the old 'common' Japanese way. Later, the damage done could not be undone. Such developments are actually not surprising and are met with under similar circumstances in every place, including our European languages. Indiscriminative respect for a foreign culture harms the indigenous way of life.

Pronunciation of the characters varied in the numerous parts of the immense Chinese empire to the extent that a man from the North was not able to understand the speech of a man from the South. Since Buddhism was transplanted from South-Eastern China to Korea and from there to Japan, the Japanese as a matter of course became acquainted with the South Chinese pronunciation. In addition to that, the Japanese

were not used to certain sequences of sounds, as for example all syllables ending with a consonant (*n* excepted), as well as the color of various vowels, which gave cause to further changes in the spoken language. The pronunciation of the Chinese characters (imported to Japan from the South of China) is called Go-on. Go-on is the Japanese pronunciation of Chinese *Wu yin*; Wu is the name of the province Kiangsu. This was, so to speak, the clerical pronunciation prevalent in Japan already in the fifth and certainly in the sixth century.

Through other contacts which had nothing to do with the Buddhist religion, Japan later became acquainted with Northern China too. That was approximately in the seventh century. As stated above the Northern Chinese had a pronunciation which was rather different from that of the South-East. This Northern pronunciation was called Kan-on, Chinese *Han-yin*. Han, originally the name of a Chinese dynasty, is used as a common designation of China.

The Japanese did of course experience extreme difficulties in trying to use Chinese characters for their own language. Formerly, the Japanese did not have a script of their own. All

tradition was oral as with many other nations. The oldest Japanese history, Kojiki dated 712 A.C., expressly states that the old songs contained therein were written down from oral tradition. Due to the geographical position of their country, the Japanese could not become acquainted with any script other than the Chinese which was, naturally, for their language just as unfit as the Arabic alphabet for the Persian and Turkish languages; for the language structure of Arabic is altogether different from that of Persian or Turkish : all these three languages belong to different linguistic families.

From the viewpoint of glottology Chinese and Japanese have nothing to do with each other. There is hardly a greater difference imaginable than that between the two, as between Chinese and other languages like Korean and Turkish, which are structurally related to Japanese. In Chinese inflection is unknown. Tenses and modes of action are, if necessary, rendered by isolated words, which always retain their isolated meaning. The idea of a sentence is implied in Chinese by the syntactic relations of the meanings of the characters. A differentiation between nouns and verbs is–strictly speaking–not possible;

and our conceptions of sentence structure do not carry any weight in Chinese, no matter how natural they might seem to us. By its position within the clause a certain character must be understood as a verb and must not be so in other instances. The word order in a sentence is—to state it in a very general way—Subject: Predicate: Object. In some cases particles in the beginning and at the end of a sentence have their bearing on a correct understanding, and it is chiefly the symmetry of clauses which in the classical literary language gives us the key to the correct interpretation of the meaning. The symmetry of clauses is the juxtaposition of similar sentences. Without exact and—as one can easily see—unnecessary endings, the isolated elements of a sentence are thus construed to a well-composed meaning consisting only of ideas written down side by side in simple perspicuity without any surplus ballast of words.

In Japanese things are completely different, but in this respect it does not stand alone. The situation is the same in Korean as well as in other languages. First of all, the word order is different in Japanese : Subject : Object : Predicate, just as in many other languages including the

Indo-European. The word order is, in short, not characteristic for any family of languages. Tibetan, for example, uses the same sequence as Japanese (Subject : Object : Predicate), although it is related to Chinese, and so do Korean, Turkish, Arabic and other languages.

Still more important is the fact that Japanese and Korean (as by the way also Finnish and Turkish which can not be discussed here) have a well-developed verbal system, and that in these two languages even the adjectives participate extensively in this system: for the adjective is in Japanese treated like a verb in many respects. We meet with various forms for the present tense, several forms for the past tense, the future tense, the optative, subjunctive, and concessive moods etc., and then–in addition–negative forms for all of them and others, all formed by suffixes, infixes of various kinds, which at one time were individual words but lost their meanings as such long ago. On the other hand, neither Japanese nor Korean have a plural and lack the differentiation of 'person' within the verbal system : the frightening number of verb forms are fortunately used for all the persons. Singular and plural as well as the persons can

be easily construed from the context, as is by the way also the case in Chinese and other languages: in all these tongues the plural is indicated only where it is really necessary. Each word just denotes an idea, regardless whether you talk about a single object or several of them.

All these numerous forms of the verb and the adjective could not be expressed by Chinese characters, as the latter only indicate the idea of the word. Unfortunately, the Japanese had only the Chinese characters and had to make the best of them. There would have been other possibilities but they did not suggest themselves early enough.

One of these possibilities can be seen from the Tibetan language. The Tibetans were, as far as their script was concerned, in very much the same condition as the Japanese, and moreover, the general circumstances were also very similar to those in Japan.

During the seventh century A.C., Tibet went through a striking period of progress. Just as in Japan, Buddhism was the main cause for this development. In Tibet, however, Buddhism was introduced from close-by India, chiefly from Kashmir and Nepal. Before this, the Tibetans

also did not have a script of their own. Through Buddhism they became acquainted with the North Indian alphabet. Although Tibet was always in close political and cultural contact with China and had many things in common with the latter, it never took over the Chinese script. King Srong-btsan sgam-po, a monarch of rare wisdom, ordered that a North-Western Indian alphabet be modified and introduced into Tibet. This alphabet is very simple, consisting of 30 consonants and 5 vowels-signs, and it is being used to this day.

No doubt the Indian alphabet would have been much more convenient for the Japanese than the Chinese script, and some attempts in this direction were actually made during the eighth and ninth centuries of the Christian era. But at that time the Chinese language and script had already penetrated too far. Just as in Tibet, a foreign culture had found its way into Japan together with Buddhism: it was the Indian culture in Tibet and the Chinese in Japan. The Buddhist religion, deepened by philosophical thoughts during the course of time, was the main connecting link in both cases. Actually, even the Buddhist texts introduced into Tibet

and Japan were the same, but the great difference was that in Tibet the texts were known in their original form, while in Japan they were circulated mostly in their Chinese versions, and that too through Korea. Besides, the Chinese classics were also imported via Korea.

But what was done in regard to the script? In the first place, there was no other way but to introduce the Chinese characters in all cases—and those were the most numerous—where the Japanese word was identical in meaning with the Chinese ideogram, regardless whether the word was genuine Japanese or pronounced after the Chinese fashion (Go-on or Kan-on). In cases where there were no correlating Chinese characters, that is especially for proper names, the Chinese ideograms were used phonetically. To use Chinese characters not only as ideographs but also as phonetic units to render certain sounds was of course nothing new: the Japanese could learn that from the Koreans without any trouble. Besides, even the Chinese had for a long time already been forced to use the same method for rendering Buddhist and foreign proper names. They transliterated them syllable by syllable taking from their stock of ideograms

those that had approximately the same pronunciation. Thus, to transliterate the Indian name of the river Gaṅgā, they picked up—not without perspicuous reasons—the two ideographs 恒 *hêng* and 伽 *ch'ieh* or even more often 河 *ho*, because this character at the same time conveys the idea 'river'. Moreover, even for their own language, the Chinese had since long begun to form new ideograms by using those in common use to indicate the pronunciation. For instance: 門 *mên* 'door', 悶 *mên*, 'downhearted', 問 *wên* 'to ask', 聞 *wên* 'to hear'.

The method of using Chinese characters for transliteration of complex sounds was already known to the Koreans and consequently readily adopted by the Japanese. A genuine Japanese proper name like Izanami was thus rendered by such Chinese characters as approximately cor-

responded in their pronunciation to the Japanese phonemes I-za-na-mi.

Since Japanese scholars and literati were completely familiar with Chinese and because it was not deemed right to change the Chinese sentence structure, the Chinese order of words was preserved, although it was—as has been stated before—quite different from the Japanese word order. Numerous Japanese particles and many other words, unknown to the Chinese, were just dropped; for had the Japanese attempted to transliterate all of them phonetically, things would have become rather complicated and besides, the resulting Chinese text would have looked horrible.

Due to these reasons, texts, such as the oldest Japanese history Kojiki (712 A.C.), are most similar to literary Chinese and can, in fact, be read in Chinese. They were, however, intended to be read in Japanese. To read them, the following was necessary: (1) the Chinese characters had to be read in Japanese, (2) due to the Japanese word order the characters had to be constantly transposed, (3) particles, suffixes and other words of that type had to be supplied by the reader, if necessary. This was of course a rather compli-

cated way of reading, but the Japanese had soon become used to it. They knew the Chinese language too well. Along with Buddhism, Japan had become acquainted with Chinese culture, and the works of Confucius and Mencius were, to the Japanese, the basis of all literary education, just as they had been in China for a long time. The contents of these books and the ideas expounded therein were interpreted in a national manner. Therefore, the Chinese language was not considered foreign by them. They read each Chinese sentence as a whole, and since they were familiar with its elements they transposed without special instruction the individual parts of the sentence to suit their word-order and supplied the necessary particles and endings without much ado.

Let us take, as a simple example, the first sentence of the 'Great Learning' of Confucius. In the Chinese text, it reads as follows (from right to left):

在	*tsai*	大	*ta*
明	*ming*	學	*hsüeh*
明	*ming*	之	*chih*
德	*tê*	道	*tao*

Translation: 'What the Great Learning teaches is to illustrate illustrious virtue.'

To a Chinese, these twice four characters appear as one whole clause. The individual parts—each not exactly clear in itself—in this sequence form a mosaic of a definite and complete meaning. The groups of the individual elements constitute, due to their mutual connections, one unity. The same was true for the Japanese reader. Knowing the Chinese language he automatically and almost unconsciously—I am speaking of ancient times—transposed the individual parts of the sentence. The inner relations between them remained the same: in thinking the sentence over and in understanding it the Japanese reader only followed a different order. He would, however, never dream of writing the characters in the Japanese sequence. By using a word order other than the Chinese the unity of the sentence would be lost and the whole would appear to be without due order, so to speak.

In more recent times the Japanese began to write on the left side or underneath the characters, figures and other reading-aids to indicate the necessary transpositions and thus to facilitate understanding. Thus the second line of the sentence cited above would be written as follows:

在レ
明二
明
德一

The first sign means inversion; the two other marks are the figures 2 and 1. Thus in Japanese the four characters would be read in the order :

明 德 明 在

The Japanese reader still supplied the necessary particles and suffixes without indicating them in writing, he pronounced the Chinese ideograms in Japanese, or in Sino-Japanese, if the Chinese word in question had been accepted in the Japanese language, Go-on or Kan-on. The latter procedure transformed the sentence into something Japanese. We shall see later on how the sentence was written and spoken in Japanese.

Nevertheless in course of time this method was looked upon as somewhat undesirable, and increasing cultural demands made a change necessary. By the way, the Koreans were in

just the same position as the Japanese. They had, as we stated above, brought Chinese culture to the Japanese, but later failed to meet the needs of their cultural development. They were used to writing their language with Chinese characters long before the Japanese, but they had not yet developed a system enabling them to render genuine Korean words, particles, endings etc. in an uncomplicated manner, like the Annamites who used the Chinese script since 186 A.C. If the Koreans had been in possession of such a system, the Japanese would no doubt have been able to use it as a model for their own language. It proves the remarkable ingenuity of the Japanese that they developed a method of this type long before the Koreans.

It was a noteworthy achievement that the Japanese designed a syllabic alphabet with the help of Chinese ideograms. The development and the system of this syllabic alphabet were, however, by no means sudden or preposterous. On the contrary, before them had been the Chinese usage to employ a number of well-defined ideograms for the phonetic rendering of syllables which later served almost exclusively for the purpose of syllabic transliteration of Indian

names or Sanskrit words, and complete Sanskrit sentences which were frequently met with in Buddhist texts. To cite just one example, the character 迦 was used to render the Sanskrit क. There were of course a number of possibilities to transliterate such syllables, but in course of time, exact systems of transliteration were developed.

The Japanese did the same. In the famous Japanese collection of poems Manyō-shū 'Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves' (600 to 760 A.C.), where a phonetic rendering was in many cases absolutely necessary, certain Chinese ideographs were constantly used as phonetic signs. This syllabic alphabet was called Manyō gana, as it was chiefly used in the poetical work just mentioned.

By further simplification the so-called Hiragana was developed from this Manyō-gana. Hiragana means 'flattened Kana' (Kana, in compounds also -gana, meaning 'alphabet'), because it is based on simplified Chinese characters of the cursive ductus. To illustrate how the Japanese had recourse to Chinese usage in developing

Hiragana, reference may be made to the Hiragana sign か standing for the syllable *ka*.

The connection with Chinese 加 is clear.

The order of the Hiragana letters thus adopted was at first not based on scientific principles. Kōbō Daishi, a famous Buddhist monk, for the first time designed a fixed order by writing a stanza in which each letter was used once and only once. Anyone knowing the stanza also knows the syllabic alphabet.

Iro wa nioedo	*Ui no oku-yama*
Chirinuru wo	*Kyō koete*
Waga yo tare zo	*Asaki yume miji*
Tsune naran	*Ei mo sezu.*

The translation would read as follows:

Although the colors (of the flowers) were of beautiful brightness,
They have fallen to the ground, alas!
Who in this world will enjoy duration?
Crossing the outer border of this passing world
This very day,

I will not see another useless dream
Nor be captured by the intoxication (of this
world .

This alphabet, called *Iroha* after its first three characters, runs as follows:

i ro ha ni ho he to chi ri nu ru (wo)
wa ka yo ta re so tsu ne na ra mu u (w)i
no o ku ya ma ke fu ko e te a sa ki yu me
mi shi (w)e hi mo se su n

The Japanese still have another syllabic alphabet, called 'Kata-kana', which means 'fragmentary Kana', because it is made up of parts of Chinese characters. The Katakana is based on the same principle as Hiragana; the shape of the letters is somewhat more quadrate. The Katakana letters are however arranged after a scientific system, the so-called 'Fifty-sounds-Table' (*go-ju-on*), which is mentioned for the first time in 1185 A.C. The sequence of these syllables (*a i u e o, ka ki ku ke ko* etc.) immediately reminds us of the scientific arrangement of the Indian letters.

The Indians possessed this order long before the Christian era, whilst the order of letters in other alphabets is not systematic, perhaps having been designed with reference to certain parts of

a text or to something else, no longer known. The Indian signs represent at the very bottom a syllable-writing, because to each consonant belongs the short *a*-vowel, the other vowels being marked by small signs above or below.

Thus we see that for the slow growth of Hiragana and Katakana the Chinese habits and the Indian arrangement were of decisive importance. Naturally the Japanese Buddhists were acquainted with Sanskrit texts. A lot of them existed in Central Asia and China. Besides, there were Indian alphabets in China, Central Asia, Korea and Japan. In Central Asia, we have to search for the origin of the scientific order of Katakana.

It is rather interesting to see how the Koreans, having once been the teachers of the Japanese, but now behind them, helped themselves. Like the Japanese they also tried to put their words, endings etc. into phonetic writing with Chinese signs. The result was confusion. In about 1450, that is 700 years later than the Japanese, they developed their own alphabet. Each consonant and each vowel came to have its own symbol. These symbols are written in groups, each group representing a syllable. The

syllables are arranged in vertical lines from right to left as in Chinese. To give an example, the word *onal* (meaning 'today') is written as:

오 *o*

날 *nal* ㄴ ㅏ ㄹ

n a l

To return to Japanese, late in the 9th century the Kana was totally accepted in Japan. As has been said before, there are two kinds of Kana: Hiragana and Katakana. Hiragana is normally written along with Chinese characters with which it fits in admirably well. The angular Katakana is not so used, being employed in the transcription of foreign names and for some other special purposes.

大學の道は明德を
明らかにするに在る

To give a picture of the combination of Chinese writing with Hiragana we shall return once again to our first sentence of Confucius' 'Great Learning'. In Japanese (no more Chinese now) its translation would look as sideways:

Daigaku no michi wa myotoku wo akiraka ni suru ni aru.

It would certainly be possible to write Japanese in Kana alone, avoiding the use of Chinese characters altogether. Then the Japanese writing would be as simple as that of any other language. One has to consider about 2000 Chinese characters, for higher pretensions even 5000 and more. In fact sometimes they wrote in Hiragana only using but a small number of Chinese characters, especially during the 11th century. In modern times also efforts have been and are being made still to write Kana only, which would be of great advantage for the requirements of daily life. Against exclusive use of Kana it cannot be objected that a large number of Japanese words have too many meanings so that it would become doubtful what is meant in the case in question, while the Chinese ideograms suggest the right meaning. This difficulty may exist only for us when studying Japanese; the Japanese himself will immediately recognize the correct meaning from the context.

Even in Chinese, where the number of words which have the same pronunciation but different meanings is indeed very large, the difficulties caused by the coincidence of pronunciation are not so great as may be assumed. Context and

theme show in general the right meaning clearly. Sometimes, however, doubts will arise. An example may be given. There are in Chinese about 70 words of different meaning which all are pronounced *shih* (the sound indicated by *ih* is spoken like a vague इ *i* tending towards अ *ə*). From this number the following six may be selected :

世	是	石	食	十	失
shih^1	*shih*^{1}	*shih*^{2}	*shih*^{2}	*shih*^{2}	*shih*^{1}
		(*shik*)	(*shik*)	(*ship*)	(*shit*)
world	this	stone	to eat	ten	to loose

These single *shih*s have not always been the same and in some important dialects nowadays also they are different. But especially in the widely spread North-Chinese pronunciation the final consonants *p*, *t* and *k* spoken in former times (and indicated above within brackets) have been lost, while in the dialects of Canton, Amoy, Shanghai and so on they are spoken still. The loss of the final consonants caused a certain change in tone. In Chinese every word has its special tone which is inseparable from the word. In Pekinese there are four different tones, in

other idioms even more. In the examples given above the tones are indicated by added figures.

As there are about 70 *shihs* with different meanings, it will be evident that it is scarcely possible to transliterate the Chinese language with Roman characters, even if the tones are added by figures. Before all in literary language, where the amount of words is much greater than in conversational language, there would arise the doubt as to which of the 70 different *shihs* is meant.

In Northern Chinese the coincidence of words with the same pronunciation but different meanings has amounted to such a degree that there exist altogether only about 420 different words, the term 'word' taken as a single sound (as *i*, *ê*, *ssŭ* and so on) or a combination of sounds to one syllable (as *ching*, *fan*, *yu* and so on). In many cases, however, ambiguity may be avoided by forming compounds of two words; but we can not give here more details.

As said before these difficulties do not exist to the same degree in Japanese, the less because in Japanese there is, in contrast to Chinese, a clear distinction between noun, verb, adjective, adverb and so on.

It would then be possible to write Japanese in Kana only or even in Roman characters. Indeed there are such tendencies, but until now they have had no success. The Japanese see in their writing, which is a combination of Chinese characters with the elegant Hiragana, their own national script. They do not want to replace it by a writing with which they have no 'inner contact.'

Chinese writing is with its many thousand years old and still continuing growth, the symbol of the whole of East Asian culture, to the extension and care of which the Japanese rightly claim an immense, in modern times certainly the most important, share. Besides, it is a means for understanding between the different people in the vast countries of the Far East; it is a means by which they have a coherence sanctified by tradition.

If the Japanese decide to give up Chinese writing, it would mean to them a break with the past. They would no longer understand their own literature of the past which would be forgotten very soon. Their glorious tradition would at once be put under a cover so to speak. The knowledge of the development of their

culture would be the privilege of a learned few. It is rather doubtful if they will take such a decisive step.

Concerning the literary style we may add here that until modern times books were not written in the common spoken language. There exists in Japan a literary language which differs widely from the idiom used in common life, not only in vocabulary but also in grammar. The difference between the two is so great that one who knows the spoken idiom alone is not able to read the literary language. It was used by the great literary men of the Middle Ages and has conserved its character to this day. Now, however, it is being replaced more and more by the standard colloquial language.

From what has been said before the Japanese writing consists, on the one hand, of Chinese characters which give so to speak nothing more than the contents of the word, and on the other hand of the Hiragana syllabic signs which give the endings, particles and all what is pure Japanese. To be able to read the Chinese charac ters one has to know their Japanese pronunciation. This is of three kinds: purely Japanese, Kan-on, and Go-on, the two being called Sino-

Japanese. As regards the Chinese characters there is a tendency to limit their use.

The written language allows a man who knows Chinese to understand a text to a certain degree, but he cannot read it loudly to others. A certain knowledge of the Japanese particles and suffixes, which are written with Hiragana, would nevertheless give a corresponding greater certainty. On the other hand, a Japanese may understand the core of a Chinese text, but he too cannot read it in the Chinese way.

This all shows the great value and significance of Chinese writing. If e.g. a Korean, a Japanese, a North-Chinese and South-Chinese and may be also an Annamite sit together and read loudly for each other a text, e.g. from Confucius, certainly none of them would understand. But if each of them were to look into the written text, he would understand it immediately. Thus the script is a cultural bond between all of them, and an ancient one.

The combination of Chinese characters with Kana can be easily effected due to the fact that the individual Japanese word does not undergo any changes with a very few exceptions where Kana is used. There is no 'ablaut' or 'umlaut',

as we know them from the tongues with which we are familiar. The stem of a verb or an adjective is immutable, regardless of suffixes or infixes. It it almost the same as in Turkish, where also we do not meet with irregular verbs. In Korean, however, there are some difficulties in this respect. Here the stem of a word might undergo modifications due to the addition of certain endings.

On the other hand, the use of Chinese ideograms causes difficulties, for no one can tell off-hand how the Chinese element is to be pronounced, while all endings and particles—in fact all that is written in Kana—can be easily pronounced. The difficulty lies still deeper. Japanese is pervaded with Chinese elements to the point, and most of the words can be pronounced in Chinese as well as in Japanese. Since on the top of this there are two different pronunciations for each Chinese word, Go-on and Kan-on, we have in numerous cases three possibilities for reading a single word: the genuine Japanese pronunciation, the Go-on and the Kan-on, all three considered as 'Japanese'. By just looking at a Chinese character in a Japanese text one can not decide immediately as to the

pronunciation. There is not even a rule available according to which a certain character has to be pronounced in a certain way. Experience is all that matters. The difficulty is however especially felt by us,—before all when it comes to compound expressions; but even a Japanese is not always sure. Therefore in many books, Hiragana is added on the right side of Chinese characters. For example:

明	Pronunciation in Northern Chinese: *ming* (1) in Go-on: *myō* (2) in Kan-on: *mei* (3) in Japanese (genuine): *aku*
明日	(1) *myōnichi* 'to-morrow'
明朝	(1) *myōchō* 'tomorrow morning'
明治	(2) *Meiji* 'the era from 1868 to 1911'
明月	(2) *meigetsu* 'full moon'
明り	(3) *akari* 'light'

月 'moon' Go on : *getsu*,
Northern Chinese : *yüeh*
Amoy : *kwat*
Canton :,*üt*

日 'sun' Go-on : *nichi, jitsu, hi*
Northern Chinese : *jih*
Canton : *jit*
Shanghai : *nih*.

These examples will show to what extent Chinese words have crept into Japanese. All of them are 'loan-words', but 'borrowed' in a way that the Japanese language could not exist without them. We meet with Chinese words in Japanese even in cases where other languages would probably get along without a foreign expression. But these borrowed words are not considered foreign by the Japanese, they have acquired Japanese pronunciation, while on the other hand the old genuine Japanese words have been either forgotten or become obsolete. If the Japanese attempted to rid themselves of all Chinese words—an attempt that of course no one would earnestly consider—they could count till ten only; for all numerals higher than ten are Chinese and the greater part of the old Japanese numerals are known no more. In fact, even the

numerals from one to ten are expressed in Chinese far more often than in Japanese. Thus Japanese is closely connected with Chinese, especially the literary language, and this connection is sanctioned by a long historical development which has resulted in the formation of the Japanese language as we know it now, a language that is no more Chinese. Compound expressions which are of tremendous importance in Japanese as well as in Chinese can be understood in many cases in their Japanese meaning only, while as Chinese they would have a completely different meaning, provided they be in use in Chinese proper. For instance :

船頭

Japanese : *sendō*, 'captain of a ship'
Chinese : *ch'uan t'ou*, 'the prow or bow of a ship'.

sen is the Japanese pronunciation (Kan-on) of Chinese *ch'uan*, *dō* (*tō*) of Chinese *t'ou*. The first character means 'ship' in both languages and the second 'head'. As a compound, however, they show a different meaning in the two languages.

In the end I must state that I have perhaps spoken more about the Japanese script than about the Japanese language. The script in Japanese

is however of greater importance than in other languages. We are writing, basically speaking, more or less phonetically, and from time to time we are forced to change our orthography to bring it up to the latest developments of the spoken language. If this is not done (as in English), the phonetical signs no longer correspond to the pronunciation. For Japanese on the other hand the script constitutes the permanent element. It remains the same and in its basic conception is not dependent upon the pronunciation of words: it has been so for centuries. Japanese is structurally simple and defined by strict rules, only the immense stock of forms makes it difficult for us. But this is not a real handicap. The Japanese language and script form one unity and this is the reason why we can not understand it without being familiar with Chinese.

It is my pleasant duty to thank Dr. Shodo Taki for writing down the Chinese characters which appear in this article.